DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 485 SO 009 581

AUTHOR Burnham, Brian; Murphy, Joseph

TITLE Measuring the Moral Reasoning Power of Elementary School Students: A Report of a Two-Year Study.

INSTITUTION York County Board of Education, Aurora (Ontario).
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Dept. of Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 184p.
AVAILABLE FROM York County Board of Education, Box 40, Aurora, Ontario, L4G 3H2, Canada ($5.00 paperbound)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; *Educational Research; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Forced Choice Technique; *Measurement Techniques; *Moral Development; *Moral Issues; Moral Values; *Observation; Research Methodology; Role Playing; Secondary School Students

ABSTRACT

This document reports on research to determine the moral maturity of elementary and secondary school students. One aspect of the project involved the development and field-testing of The Important Considerations Survey (ICS), an objective paper-and-pencil instrument that attempts to determine a student's level of moral reasoning along Kohlberg's six-stage continuum. Two experimental forms were field-tested on 11 to 16 year olds. After students read four stories containing moral dilemmas, they rated the relative importance of many considerations that might precede decision making. A detailed scoring manual is presented. As outgrowths of the ICS activity, two research projects were undertaken to explore moral reasoning abilities of younger elementary pupils for whom the ICS would be inappropriate. The Dilemma Decisions Project involved 4th, 5th, and 6th graders in considering moral dilemmas presented in certain situations and in suggesting possible consequences of various alternatives on the actors involved in the dilemma. An attempt was made to assess moral reasoning levels from the class discussion. The Role-Playing Project exposed 2nd, 3rd, and 4th graders to a series of structured role-playing activities in an attempt to influence their moral reasoning levels. Rationale, reviews of relevant literature, and results of the two projects are described. (Author/AV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138485

OCT 26 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MEASURING THE MORAL REASONING POWER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Bacsalmasi
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

A Report of a Two-Year Study

Funded in part by the Ministry of Education, Ontario
through the Grants-in-Aid of Educational Research Program
1974 - 1976

SEPTEMBER 1976

SP009581

Principal Investigators

Brian Burnham
Chief Research Officer

Joseph Murphy
Chief Testing Officer

THE YORK COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
Box 40, Aurora, Ontario
L4G 3H2

ABSTRACT

MEASURING THE MORAL REASONING POWER OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

A recognition of the need for more appropriate means of determining students' moral maturity provided the impetus for this project. Such means were seen to be essential for both instructional purposes (needs assessment) and determining program effectiveness. Existing measurement devices were found to be unsatisfactory for both technical and practical reasons.

The primary focus of this research was the development of The Important Considerations Survey (ICS) as an objective measure of moral reasoning power. The ICS was derived from the cognitive-developmental theory of moral reasoning enunciated by Lawrence Kohlberg and his associates. Kohlberg has described six stages of moral maturity and grouped these stages into three levels: preconventional, conventional, and post-conventional. The ICS is a "paper-and-pencil" instrument that attempts to determine a student's level of moral reasoning along Kohlberg's continuum from stage one to stage six.

Two experimental formats of the ICS have been prepared and field tested on pupils aged 11 to 16. Both formats present the student with four stories, each of which contains a moral dilemma. Rather than asking for the most appropriate decision to be made, the ICS focuses on the many considerations that might precede decision-making. From a student's ratings of the relative importance of each of these considerations, an estimate of his moral reasoning power is derived. The Open-Ended Format (Form A) of the ICS allows the student to construct original considerations by "writing in" what he considers to be important. One

consequence of this has been the need to provide detailed guidelines for scoring constructed responses. The scoring manual attempts to provide such detail. The Forced-Choice Format (Form 78FC) demands that the students respond only to those considerations provided; no "write-ins" are permitted. This latter form (Form 78FC) is thus somewhat easier to score in that no interpretation is required on the part of the scorer. Since the tasks involved in completing the two forms are slightly different, Forms A and 78FC are not considered to be alternate forms in the strict sense of the term.

Some evidence of the reliability and validity of the ICS has been established. However, the strength of this evidence has not been sufficient to convince the authors to remove the "trial edition" rider from the ICS.

The development of the ICS has been the primary focus of this research. However, early in the life of the project it became obvious that the "paper-and-pencil" format would probably not be appropriate for younger elementary pupils. A decision was made to explore downward extensions of Kohlberg's theory with a view towards developing a better understanding of possible approaches to assessment of moral reasoning at these early ages. At the present time no instruments have been developed; however, the knowledge gained from two research projects will hopefully provide useful leads in the development of instruments for use with pupils below age 11.

The Dilemma Discussions Project was a classroom research endeavour in which students in grades 4, 5, and 6 in two schools were presented with moral dilemmas and asked to generate considerations. In addition, the students were asked to suggest the possible consequences of various alternatives on the actors

involved in the dilemma. One of the objectives of this project was to attempt to assess students' moral reasoning levels from the dialogue of the class during the discussion period. Although slight differences in the level of reasoning were noted between grades four and six, the project leaders felt that the task needs considerable refining. The possibility of employing a semi-structured classroom observation schedule is being explored.

The Role-Playing Project was conducted by an elementary school guidance counsellor. Grades 2 and 4 pupils were exposed to a series of structured role-playing activities in an attempt to influence their moral reasoning levels. The research of William Damon of Clark University and Robert Selman of Harvard focused on the extension of Kohlberg's theory downward to include persons between ages 4 and 10. Damon redefined the premoral and preconventional levels described by Kohlberg, and Selman developed a parallel sequence of developmental structures that a child displays in his understanding of another's point of view (perspective-taking). The role-playing methodology developed at Stanford by Fannie and George Shaftel was employed in an attempt to influence moral reasoning and social perspective-taking levels. Included in the project were assessments of moral reasoning levels and social perspective-taking levels using the semi-structured interviews developed by Damon and Selman. The time required for administration of these interviews poses serious problems that must be overcome; however, the knowledge and insights gained from this project ought to be helpful in our efforts to refine the measurement tool.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Title Page		i
Abstract		ii
Table of Contents		v
SECTION I:		
	A Scoring Manual for the ICS	1
	ICS - Form A	71
	ICS - Form 78FC	82
SECTION II:		
	Dilemma Discussions Project	93
SECTION III:		
	Role-Playing Project	136

SECTION I

A Scoring Manual for the ICS

ICS - Form A

ICS - Form 78FC

A SCORING MANUAL FOR

THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

A MEASURE OF MORAL REASONING POWER

LEVEL 2: GRADES 7 TO 10

Brian Burnham

Research Department
Division of Planning and Development
The York County Board of Education

JULY 1976

A Scoring Manual For

THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

a measure of moral reasoning power

Level 2: Grades 7 to 10

Trial Edition

Brian Burnham

Research Department
Division of Planning and Development
The York County Board of Education

JULY 1976

The development of the Important Considerations Survey, a measure of moral reasoning power, was made possible by an Ontario Ministry of Education Grant-in-Aid of Educational Research

Copyright (c) 1976 by The York County Board of Education

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
The Important Considerations Survey: A Stage-Sequence Approach	2
The Moral Stages	5
ICS Formats	7
The Open-Ended Format: Form A	8
Scoring	11
Ambiguous Considerations Defined	13
Unscorable Considerations Defined	15
Some Special Cases	15
Calculating a Moral Reasoning Score (MRS)	17
Guide to the Scoring of Each Story	19
Story I -- Teammates	20
Examples of Considerations, by stages	22
Ambiguous Considerations	25
Unscorable Considerations	26
Story II -- The Overdose	27
Examples of Considerations, by stages	29
K Statements	32
Ambiguous Considerations	33
Unscorable Considerations	33
Story III -- The Class Sale	34
Examples of Considerations, by stages	36
Ambiguous Considerations	40
Unscorable Considerations	40
Story IV -- Rock Concert	41
Examples of Considerations, by stages	43
Ambiguous Considerations	46
Unscorable Considerations	47

CONTENTS (continued)

The Forced-Choice Format: Form 78FC	49
Scoring	51
Technical Data	53
Directions For Administering the ICS	63
Use of the ICS	68
Appendices	
A. ICS Level 2, Form A	71
B. ICS Level 2, Form 78FC	82

THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

a measure of moral reasoning power

INTRODUCTION

In school, at home, on the playing field, on the part-time job, in a host of private and social settings, young people find themselves in situations in which their moral judgment is tested. Moral dilemmas, situations where the different values compete for a person's loyalties, are inevitable at all ages. Parents, clergymen, educators, and other interested adults are properly concerned to help young people achieve ever greater power to cope with such dilemmas.

The development* of moral reasoning power is only one of many approaches to values education. Like the analysis approach, moral reasoning emphasizes rationality and aims to develop more complex patterns of reasoning. The methods used in the moral reasoning approach do provide also for the affective education of learners, helping them to come to grips with their own feelings, attitudes, wants, and needs in a world which expects of them considerable "prosocial" as distinct from self-serving behavior. The emphasis, nonetheless, is on rationality.

Teachers, who are charged with the character development of their students, can be considerably assisted by a well-founded description of how moral reasoning develops. To be most useful, such a theoretical model would be coupled with descriptions of the style of thinking about moral issues and concerns which characterizes each successive stage of maturation.

---

* To some psychologists, "development" is rather strictly defined as the genetic unfolding of the human organism. When the social environment is structured to accelerate or sustain development, as it may be in any educational setting, change in the human organism is said to be "growth" rather than "development." Normally both development and growth occur as the child interacts within the various social environments he encounters. To simplify, in this manual "development" and "growth" are used more colloquially, hence interchangably. Even though the distinctions which could be made are acknowledged, no benefit would accrue from using the terms in their more narrow contexts.

On the basis of such a developmental model and stage characterizations, an instrument (device or procedure) has been designed to help the teacher to assess just where a student is with respect to his/her moral reasoning power. Such insight would be invaluable in helping the teacher to pitch instruction at the level appropriate to the student. For example, if there was an immediate need to deal with a moral values problem, the discourse could be conducted at, or just slightly above, the power level of the student. If, on the other hand, the teacher's concern was for building the student's moral reasoning power, then instruction might be geared to encouraging the student to "stretch" from his present stage to the next stage in the developmental sequence. Values education, especially moral education, programs could be enhanced by such insight.

In addition, the existence of such an "instrument" to help assess moral reasoning would be useful in evaluating the impact of instruction over time, say after students had been exposed to a moral values education program.

THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY: A STAGE-SEQUENCE APPROACH

The Important Considerations Survey (ICS) was originally conceived as an economical means of estimating the moral reasoning power of adolescent students aged about 12-16 years who have no major reading problems or special difficulties in expressing their ideas in writing. An alternate format has also been designed to obviate the opportunity (and hence need) to make any written response.

The ICS is intended as an alternative to the interview (or clinical) method of measuring moral maturity as used by, for example, Jean Piaget or Lawrence Kohlberg. A variation of Kohlberg's interview format exists as a "paper-and-pencil" instrument and is described in Porter and Taylor's How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students (Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972). However, both methods take much

time or expertise to administer and to score. Existing "paper-and-pencil" instruments have been tried and found wanting, especially with younger adolescents.

The ICS is rooted in Kohlberg's stage-sequence theory of the growth of moral reasoning power. While ICS is patterned upon the Kohlbergian developmental model and its stage characteristics, ICS has some refinements which grew from research conducted in York County since 1970 and also from the testing of the ICS instruments with students in several jurisdictions.

The theoretical rationale of the ICS is derived from various research-supported propositions about the growth of moral reasoning capacity in young people across cultures. Individually these propositions should be viewed as somewhat tentative; collectively they have proved a most useful approach to understanding a complex developmental process.

The ICS is based on the following 23 propositions. (1) The development of reasoning power may be viewed as progress through a series of stages. (2) The ego is involved from the outset, with each successive stage of development characterized as somewhat less ego-constrained (or ego-referenced) than the previous. (3) Every stage has its own integral pattern or structure of valuing. (4) Everyone progresses through the stage in (5) an invariant sequence (6) at different rates and (7) may stop at any stage. (8) A person may be in transition from one stage to the next higher and hence give evidence of being in two stages at a time. (9) A person will not regress in moral reasoning power (except due to mental dysfunction, as in senility) (10) but, since each stage incorporates all previous valuing styles, a "residue" of earlier structures may sometimes seem to be in control. (11) Of course, a person might choose at any time to decide and act in a way inconsistent with the available reasoning power and past behavior. (12) One comprehends all earlier stages of reasoning and (13) generally finds them unattractive as they are seen to be less powerful

valuing processes which produce less satisfactory decisions and consequences. (14) One cannot comprehend reasoning two stages higher than one's own. A person may react in either of two basic ways to reasoning patterns more mature than his own. (15) Reasoning too far above one's present stage may be "translated" or "corrupted" and made to fit into the present structure of reasoning (Piaget speaks of "assimilation" and "accommodation"). Alternatively, (16) when presented with reasoning just one stage above the present level, a new, more comprehensive structure (stage) may be generated within the individual as an attempt is made to apply the new structure to the resolution of a values conflict the old structure could not deal with adequately. (17) One's moral reasoning may be placed into disequilibrium (a state conducive to new learning) when one's reasoning is seen to be too inadequate to deal effectively with a dilemma and one feels obliged to grope toward a more powerful moral reasoning style. (18) Growth to a higher stage is triggered by a continuing state of disequilibrium, hence development normally occurs over a long period of time. However, (19) there are some indications that there may be "spurt" growth periods at about 13 and 18 years of age but it is not clear to what extent this is genetically (as distinct from environmentally) programmed. (20) Moral reasoning styles (stages) are hierarchial inasmuch as each successively higher stage is a more powerful general mode of handling moral dilemmas. (21) Many adults do not progress beyond stage 3 on this stage scale. (22) Moral reasoning power is not an absolute predictor of moral action because many situational variables mediate between cognitive operation and behavior. (23) Everyday's most common needs do not usually call forth manifestations of one's highest level of cognitive reasoning: therefore, even careful observation of spontaneous behavior may result in an underestimation of moral reasoning power.

THE MORAL STAGES

Kohlberg has described six stages of moral maturity and grouped these stages into three levels, preconventional, conventional, and postconventional.

For students, age and moral maturity are generally related, especially in younger children. There is considerable variance in development at any school age, however. Most children under 10 years are principally at the preconventional moral level. On this level (stages 1 and 2) the child is responsive to cultural labels of good and bad, right or wrong. The child interprets these labels in terms of the physical consequences of action (e.g., punishment or reward) or in terms of the power of the rule-makers. Rules and social expectations are understood as something external to the self. Preconventional reasoning embraces only one person's point of view at a time. This is referred to as the "isolated individual" social perspective since the needs of an individual (possibly weighed against those of another person) are the bases of all considerations. There appears to be little or no conception of the concern of others (e.g., family, community) in a general sense or any appreciation of the importance of maintaining social relationships.

Stage 1 may be termed the punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of action determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and unquestioning deference to power are valued in their own right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order supported by punishment and authority. Stage 1 involves only the individual's point of view.

Stage 2 may be termed the instrumental relativist orientation. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. Human relations are viewed in terms like those of the market place. Elements of fairness, of reciprocity, and of equal sharing are present, but they are always interpreted in a

physical, pragmatic way. Reciprocity is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," not of loyalty, gratitude, or justice. The stage 2 point of view is more developed in that it is aware of a number of other individuals, each having other points of view. Stage 2 reasoning anticipates others' viewpoints and uses such insights in the formulation of a point of view. Unless a deal is made, it is understood that each will put his own point of view first.

The conventional level (stage 3 and 4) is the level of most adolescents and adults in our society and other societies. The term "conventional" means conforming to and upholding the rules and expectations of society or authority (e.g., one's family, group or nation) just because these are society's rules, expectations or conventions. This includes actively maintaining, supporting, and justifying the order, and of identifying with the persons or group involved in it.

Stage 3 may be termed the interpersonal concordance, or "good boy - nice girl" orientation. Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images. Stage 3 reasoning is guided by relatively unexamined notions of what is majority, or good and "natural" behavior. Behavior is frequently judged by intention -- "He means well" becomes important for the first time. One earns approval by being "nice." The stage 3 perspective sees things from the point of view of shared relationships between two or more individuals, relations of caring, trust, respect, etc. Concern is lacking for society as a whole or for its institutions.

Stage 4 is often referred to as the "law and order" orientation. There is orientation toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social

order for its own sake. Stage 4 reasoning clearly reflects the perspective of someone taking the point of view of the social system or society as a whole.

The postconventional, autonomous, or principled level (stage 5 and 6) is reached by a minority of adults and usually only after the age of 20 to 25. Those at this level understand and basically accept society's rules but this acceptance and understanding is based on the prior formulation and acceptance of general moral principles or values underlying society's rules. When general moral principles come into conflict with society's rules, the postconventional individual judges by principle.

While using this six stage model, the authors of the ICS recognize and view as potentially useful current research which defines a stage 0, which offers subdivisions within stages 0-5, and which speculates upon a stage ("rational mysticism") beyond stage 6.

ICS FORMATS

Two experimental formats of the ICS have been prepared and extensively field tested. As the term "experimental" suggests, it is expected that continuing trials will result in further refinement of the ICS. The intended range of use is principally with grades 7 to 10, ages 11 to 16. This age - grade sequence has been designated as "Level 2".* This manual is for use in scoring both formats of the ICS Level 2, the March 1976 (or 0376) Trial Edition.

Both formats present the reader (normally a student) with four dilemma stories, in addition to a sample story, each of which embodies a moral conflict. These stories appear below (pages 20, 27, 34, 41). Each story leaves someone wondering what to do. A decision must be made and many considerations may be important in the decision making. The

---

* In earlier versions of this manual mention was made of "A senior level ICS for secondary school and possibly adult populations." Early drafts of this senior level (Level 1) instrument were field tested through 1974-76. Interested parties should contact the author for further information.

respondent (to whom we shall also refer to as the student) is not asked to make a decision but rather to deal with the possible considerations which might enter into the deciding processes.

Kohlberg's strategy has been to ask the respondent to make a decision, then to say why this decision was "right," or some variant of this routine. This approach has not been followed in the ICS as it was observed that "taking a stand," then defending it, tended to produce defensive rationalizations. These were sometimes at a lower level than the student's actual moral reasoning capacity. Asking for "important considerations" seems to obviate this problem.

Exactly what we mean by "important considerations" will become clearer as the first ICS format is described. The two formats differ in several respects beyond their physical appearance. The formats suppose some differences in the nature of the respondents and the purposes of the test administrator. But the theoretical basis (developmentalism) is the same in both instances.

THE OPEN-ENDED FORMAT: FORM A

This form is better suited when one wishes to estimate the highest stage of moral reasoning which can be evoked from a respondent or when one wants a maximum spread of scores. It may not suit the somewhat immature or inarticulate pre-teen student, but is recommended where one expects to find a high degree of conventional level reasoning.

Previous attempts have been made to replace the clinical interview method used by Kohlberg. Such have produced either a paper-and-pencil replication or adaptation of the interview questions (e.g., the OISE work mentioned earlier) or forced-choice formats (e.g., James Rest's Defining Issues Test). To avoid the problems encountered in the OISE approach, this project first attempted to adapt forced-choice formats used with adults to the circumstances involved in working with adolescents.

But even though the panels of alternatives from which our youthful respondents were "forced" to choose "important considerations" was large, some expressed a strong desire to write in their own considerations. By trial and error a "mixed format" evolved.

The "mix" combines a panel of considerations and also provides an opportunity for respondents to express in their own words what they feel or think to be "important considerations." This came to be termed an "Open-Ended Format" although, in fact, a respondent is not obliged to construct any responses whatsoever for the majority of the dilemma stories, as shall be shown, below. But first the point must be made that such a format presents theoretical and practical problems which cannot be said to be completely overcome.

The most significant of the practical problems* is that the constructed responses ought idealy be evaluated by a trained, experienced scorer, someone familiar with developmental psychology in general and Kohlberg's model in particular. The next best situation is to provide a detailed scoring manual by which a relatively naive person could learn to score. That is, more or less, the main purpose of this manual. This also accounts both for the attention given in the opening pages to Kohlberg's stage-sequence model and for the great detail provided in the sections on scoring of this format.

---

* A theoretical problem with practical implications is that the respondent who opts for more than the minimum amount of "writing in" is not (it could be argued) performing the same task as the respondent who chooses not to construct any more "important considerations" than required. There is some indication that the act of constructing responses may produce lower moral reasoning scores. This has practical implications for comparing scores produced under the different possibilities. If the different response modes also produce unreliable scores for an individual (who alternates between minimum and maximum construction of responses) there may be even more serious implications. Carefully structured trials are called for.

The ICS open-ended format operates at two levels. For three stories there is the "mixed format" just described. The fourth story offers a more truly open-ended format. The fourth story requires that the respondent construct "important considerations" in his own words. After producing whatever he can, the respondent then proceeds with the next steps as with the other three dilemma stories. It now remains to see what those steps, or tasks, consist of.

For the first three stories the respondent has three tasks to perform. First, he is to rate eight given considerations according to their importance: none, some, or great. (Students are asked to check "none" in response to given considerations which they do not understand.) The panels of given considerations appear below (pages 21, 26, 35). Second, he may add one or two considerations which he feels are important. Finally, he is to rank order what he sees as the three most important considerations for each story. In the fourth story no considerations are given and the student is to construct a panel from which he is to choose the three most important. The three considerations chosen by the respondent for all four stories are the scorer's first concern and are the basis for calculations of moral reasoning scores.

Each of the given considerations is stated in a manner consistent with the reasoning of one particular stage. The assumption is that the respondent will choose or construct considerations which are consistent with the stages at which he is reasoning. Those considerations which the respondent discards as being of no importance are assumed to be stated at either a lower or much higher stage level than his own, or simply "not understandable."

In one story (The Overdose) we have injected two considerations which are, in fact, what test-makers call "Kangaroo" ("K") statements. These are "high sounding," verbose statements which, objectively viewed, are meaningless. Normally the respondent

will rate their importance as "none" since these are not understandable.

These "Kangaroos" are included as a check. When a student choses both as important, all his responses must generally be viewed with suspicion. There are at least three possible explanations as to why a student might report these goobledygook statements as important. First, the fine sounding words may be attractive. Second, he may think of these as socially acceptable considerations to which he must respond so as to gain the approval of the examiner (stage 3 reasoning). Finally, it may simply be that the student is a poor reader and responded to a hastily derived or false meaning. Depending on why the ICS was administered, one might wish to discover which of these possibilities obtains, or might judge the ICS as unreliable for this respondent, or might conclude that the picking of K statements was consistent with other indicators of a stage 3 conformist moral reasoning style.

Scoring

Familiarity with the general characteristics of the stages will greatly assist in determining the meaning of responses.

It is important to note that no single statement, including any given consideration, is an unambiguous indicator of the structure, style, pattern or stage of moral reasoning at work within an individual. Any single statement must be considered within the context of a sequence or pattern of statements.

Both the stories and the panels of considerations provide the students with vocabulary and possibly also with concepts. Therefore, it is not surprising that sometimes, in writing in their "own" considerations, respondents simply rewrite given considerations or use wordings which have been introduced by the ICS. The respondent who lacks good powers of

expression may be aided to make his thoughts or feelings clearer. Especially if one wishes to discover the highest stage at which the respondent is capable of reasoning, it is desirable to minimize problems such as weak powers of expression. A danger is that words (and reasoning styles) "may be put into the mouths of respondents which are not in their mental structuring" and hence an artificially high score might be attained.

Students may also rewrite given considerations in a less "elevated" way simply because they don't want to leave the space for additional considerations empty. We accept that there will be rewordings for such purposes and we don't discard such considerations on these grounds. Rather, we interpret a re-write of a given consideration at the same stage as a possible confirmation of the student's stage of reasoning. Therefore, such considerations are taken at face and scored as if they were "original" utterances.

This manual reproduces many (obviously not all possible) considerations which students have typically constructed in response to each of the four ICS stories. Many utterances fairly reflect the nature of reasoning at each stage for each story. Examples of ambiguous and unscorable utterances are also provided. An understanding of the Kohlberg model is important in interpreting the considerations a student constructs and, in turn, in assigning the appropriate stage designation to each consideration.

Each ICS story is presented in this manual and, for the first three stories, the panels of given considerations is shown. To the left of each given consideration is indicated the stage of reasoning this consideration reflects.

Scorers may note that a respondent's stage of reasoning may vary within a story and among stories. There seems to be evidence that people progress gradually from one stage of moral reasoning to another. It may also be that the progress occurs, at least in some circumstances, only one moral issue at a time. In the June 1975 draft edition of

Kohlberg's Moral Stage Scoring Manual, it is explained that:

> "A given issue is the point of entry to a given stage. Reasoning at a higher stage first appears with regard to a particular issue, then generalizes or 'spreads' to other issues," (p. 94, Part 1).

Ambiguous Considerations Defined

Ambiguous considerations reflect reasoning which contains elements of two stages. An ambiguous consideration may often be clarified by looking first at (a) the other considerations chosen in that particular story, then, if the ambiguity is not resolved, looking at (b) the general pattern of responses (the rating and ranking of given and constructed considerations) throughout the ICS.

A clear example of an ambiguous consideration can be seen with "Class Sale," p. 34 The student wrote, "Whether the teacher would mind if they change the agreement." We call this "ambiguous stage 2-3." One concern seems to be for the approval of the authority figure (the teacher). This is consistent with the social perspective of stage 3 reasoning. However, it is also possible to interpret this concern as preconventional, stage 2 reasoning. To do something which the teacher does mind is not likely to satisfy one's needs, and may in fact result in negative physical (as distinct from psychological or social) consequences.

In trying to assign a stage score to such ambiguous considerations, we use a method which we call "context scoring." We study the student's ambiguous utterance in the context of his ratings of all other considerations for that story. If he has written in another consideration, it (as well as his responses to the given considerations) is examined. We look at the stage(s) of the considerations ranked first, second, third. We look to see which, if any, considerations have been rated as "none" in terms of importance and which considerations have been rated as "great."

Suppose that a student's written consideration, which he has ranked as most important, is an ambiguous utterance, possibly a stage 2 or possibly a stage 3 style of reasoning. If the student has ranked two stage 3 considerations and given low ratings to stage 2 considerations, then there is a very good case for scoring the ambiguous item as stage 3. Similarly, if two stage 2 considerations have been ranked as important, then the ambiguous consideration may be scored as yet another case of stage 2 reasoning.

If it is not possible to determine an affiliation with either stage 2 or 3 in this way, then the student's responses to the other stories provides another context to explore. Perhaps a very clear preference for stage 2 or 3 reasoning may be found. But since the moral issues vary from story to story, different levels of reasoning are often elicited. When this is the case, the ambiguity cannot be resolved. Therefore, the consideration is left as "ambiguous stage 2-3" and is not used in the calculation of the student's Moral Reasoning Score (MRS), as described later in this manual.

Another ambiguous consideration, containing elements of both stage 3 and stage 5, was found during early trials in response to the "Rock Concert" story. The student wrote, "Whether a daughter has the right to disobey her mother." If the student had written in or chosen stage 4 or 5 considerations elsewhere in the survey this might provide sufficient reason to score this ambiguous consideration as stage 5. If such higher stage reasoning does not appear elsewhere, it should be scored as stage 3 since it reflects a conventional thinker's concern with social relationships.

As a rule, it is preferable to leave a consideration as "ambiguous" than to assign a stage score when there is a big element of doubt. "Big" is a subjective assessment which will probably depend on the experience of the scorer.

Unscorable Considerations Defined

There are two types of unscorable considerations.

Sometimes a student, in writing a consideration, does not provide enough information for stage assignment. For example, in response to "The Overdose," the student may write "Whether it is justified for the doctor to give the overdose." This may suggest what the student feels should be done but gives no clue as to his moral reasoning. Considerations such as this do not discriminate between stages and may be given as often at one stage as another. Two more examples illustrate this point: (1) "Whether Jean would be doing more harm than good by letting Sue copy." (Teammates); (2) "Whether the students would spend the money wisely if the original agreement were kept." (Class Sale).

Other unscorable considerations are those which re-state the facts of the story, or state their perception of the dilemma, or just give a solution to the dilemma. The following are two examples which were made in response to "Overdose": (1) "Whether the doctor shouldn't do it." (2) "Whether or not the doctor should give him the overdose."

Some Special Cases

It sometimes happens that a student rates the various considerations but does not rank them. Perhaps he has forgotten this part of the task, or had intended to return to this job but ran out of time. Sometimes a students ranks the considerations but rates only one or two. Occasionally a student ranks one consideration as "most important," "second most important," and "third most important." And, not uncommonly, a student may paraphrase a given consideration and rank both the original and paraphrased consideration.

What is to be done in these or other cases that do not conform to the "standard" pattern of responding to the survey? As mentioned earlier in this section, when a student rewords a given consideration and ranks the resultant paraphrase, it is assumed that the

student is telling something about his stage of moral reasoning. His data are accepted at face value, unless there are overriding considerations.

Similarly, when a student purposely ranks one consideration as first, second, and third most important, we have to assume that he is plumping for the only consideration he thinks worth ranking. In such cases each time "the same consideration" is rated, it is treated as if there were multiple considerations, each at the same stage. The rule-of-thumb is "Where the student's intent seems clear, give the apparently intended weight to the student's responses."

It is less clear about what to do when data are incomplete as, for example, when the student has rated the considerations but not ranked the three most important. Where one or two are ranked, it is suggested that the scorer use only what the student has given. Failure to give a third (or possibly also a second) "most important consideration" clearly suggests that the student knew what to do, but found difficulty, either in deciding priorities or in finding enough "important" considerations.

Where no considerations have been ranked for one story only, we have experimented by checking the ratings to see whether one or two or three considerations have been rated as of great importance and where this is so, treating them as if they had been the ranked items. This has usually, but not invariably, yielded stage scores consistent with the student's scores in other stories. This suggests that little is to be gained or lost when dealing with a group of students. But for any individual on any single story this is not always the case. Where valid and reliable individual scores are wanted, this process of inference cannot be recommended, even for one story. It is recommended that, wherever possible, students be asked to return to complete the exercise. Subsequent editions of ICS will alert administrators and those doing the survey to give attention to completing the ranking task.

Calculating a Moral Reasoning Score (MRS) for FORM A

When all the considerations which the student has ranked have been assigned a stage, the next task is to calculate a composite score. The tallying is actually done on the form which is printed on the front of the ICS. The Moral Reasoning Score (MRS) is calculated on the basis of the three considerations which the student judges to be most important for each story. Ambiguous (A), Unscorable (U), and Kangaroo (K) considerations which cannot be assigned a stage, are recorded on the tally sheet (a specimen is shown on the next page) but are not included in the calculation of the MRS.

The specimen tally sheet shows the scoring procedure used with the ICS of a grade 7 student who, in response to Teammates (Story I) ranked considerations #1 (stage 2), #2 (stage 1) and #7 (stage 2). For Overdose (Story II) the considerations ranked were #3 (Kangaroo), #6 (stage 1) and an unscorable, student-constructed consideration. For Class Sale (Story III) considerations #1 (stage 2), #2 (stage 3) and #7 (stage 2) were ranked. In response to Rock Concert (Story IV) the student constructed and ranked two stage 3 considerations and one at stage 2.

In Column "A" of the tally sheet, enter the sum of considerations chosen at each specific stage. Total Column "A" and enter this total at the foot of the column. On the specimen tally sheet, the total is 10.

Next multiply the sum of the considerations chosen at each stage, by that stage. Enter each product in Column "B". On the specimen tally sheet, 2 considerations are stage 1, so "2" (2 x 1) is entered in Column "B". Similarly 5 are stage 2, so "10" (5 x 2) is entered and 3 are stage 3 and "9" (3 x 3) is entered.

Total Column "B" and enter this total at the foot of the column.

Finally, divide the total of Column "B" by the total of Column "A" and multiply by 100. The result (rounded if necessary) is the student's Moral Reasoning Score. On the specimen the MRS is "210" (21 ÷ 10 x 100).

If for further analysis or reporting, a distribution of stage assignments is required as a percentage, a column "PC" is provided. Two of the ten assignments are stage 1 (20%), five are stage 2(50%) and three are stage 3 (30%). This, by the way, is not an unusual distribution for a grade 7 student and could be interpreted narratively something like this:

> "This student is principally reasoning at stage 2 (instrumental relativism) with stage 3 (conformist) reasoning the minor stage being shown when distributive justice and family relationships (Stories III and IV) are concerned. A residue of stage 1 reasoning is in evidence."

SPECIMEN: MRS Tally Sheet, Level 2, FORM A

	I	II	III	IV	A	B	PC
1	1	1			2	2	20
2	2		2	1	5	10	50
3			1	2	3	9	30
4							
5							
K		1			(A) 10	(B) 21	
U		1					
A							

$$MRS = \frac{(B)}{(A)} \times 100$$

$$= \frac{21}{10} \times 100 = 210$$

Guide To Scoring Each Story

Reproduced on the following pages are the four dilemma stories of the ICS Level 2, Form A. Immediately facing each of the first three stories is the format in which the student meets the "important considerations." To this specimen page has been added the stage score for each of the given considerations. For the fourth story, which has no given considerations, the format for the "reception" of student-constructed considerations is shown.

Following each story (and its "reception format") are examples of "considerations," listed by stage, from stage 1 through stage 5. Examples of ambiguous and unscorable considerations follow thereafter.

This story-by-story scoring guide cannot cover every possible response generated by students. But it does indicate the nature of statements which can and cannot be assigned a stage score and further indicates the most likely stage of the scorable utterances, including those which are ambiguous except when scored in context.

Story I

TEAMMATES

Sue and Jean are classmates and both are also stars on their school's volleyball team. The championship game is to be played on Friday afternoon.

On Monday their teacher reminded them that the end-of-term mathematics test would be held on Wednesday and results given on Thursday.

Later Sue said to Jean, "Remember, I was away all last week? I'm so far behind I'll probably fail the test and then they'll put me off the team. You're really good in math and you sit beside me in class. If you keep your paper close to the edge of the desk, I can see enough answers to pass. I'll probably only need to copy two or three answers."

Jean wondered what to do.

TEAMMATES

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
2	1. Whether Sue and Jean are close friends			
1	2. Whether Jean might be caught and given a failing mark for letting Sue copy			
3	3. Whether it was fair of the teacher to make Sue take the test so soon after a long absence			
4	4. Whether any real good could come to the school if copying on exams was practised			
5	5. Whether it would go against the rights of other students to let Sue copy			
1	6. Whether Jean could be dropped from the team if she was caught letting Sue copy			
2	7. Whether Sue had ever helped Jean in a similar situation			
3	8. Whether Sue could get extra help and learn enough math to pass			
	9. Whether _____ _____			
	10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story 1 -- Teammates: Examples of Considerations

Stage 1

(1) "Whether Jean might be caught and given a failing mark for letting Sue copy" (ICS consideration #2). Variants: "Whether Jean would get caught and fail too"; "Whether Jean and Sue could get away with it."

(2) "Whether Jean could be dropped from the team if she was caught letting Sue copy" (ICS consideration #6). Variant: "Whether they would both be off the team."

(3) "Whether Jean would be caught and her mother (father) would punish her."

(4) "Whether other students might tell on them." Variant: "Whether other students had ever been caught and what was their punishment."

Stage 1 thinking shows a concern for, if not a preoccupation with, the avoidance of physical punishment.

Stage 2

(1) "Whether Sue and Jean are close friends" (ICS consideration #1).

(2) "Whether Sue had helped Jean with other school work in the past" (ICS consideration #7). Variant: "Whether if the tables were turned, Sue would let Jean copy."

(3) "Whether Jean would lose friends by letting Sue copy."

(4) "Whether the team needed Sue so much that Jean felt she should let her copy." Variants: "Whether being on the volleyball team is worth cheating for"; "Whether the game meant a lot to Jean."

(5) "Whether the game is more important than math."

(6) "Whether not cooperating would prevent Sue from cheating." Variant: "Whether Sue cheats often needs to be stopped."

(7) "Whether Sue is thinking of Jean and the team or only of herself."

(8) "Whether Sue would not be Jean's friend any more if she didn't help her cheat." Variant: "Whether Jean has the courage to risk losing a friend."

The needs and desires of both Sue and Jean are of considerable importance to Jean's decision, in the eyes of stage 2 reasoning. The perspective is limited to that of these individuals, one at a time or reciprocally. Concerns tend to be physical and tangible, but may include a desire to avoid psychologically painful situations. Some concern to deter cheating by Sue in order to protect her own general interests may be shown by Jean.

Stage 3

(1) "Whether it was fair of the teacher to make Sue take the test so soon after a long absence" (ICS consideration #3).

(2) "Whether Sue could get extra help and learn enough math to pass" (ICS consideration #8).

(3) "Whether it is right for anyone to cheat no matter what the circumstances." Variant: "Whether it is the right thing to do"; "Whether cheating is unfair to those who were also away." (Cf this latter with ICS consideration #5, a stage 5 orientation.)

(4) "Whether it is proper to help anyone who is being tested on his/her ability."

(5) "Whether Jean saw this as helping someone who had been unfairly treated (or who needed help) rather than cheating."

Stage 3 thinking is often marked by a definite reluctance to condone cheating

and an eagerness to look for other explanations of behavior (as in 5, above) or to suggest possible socially-acceptable alternatives. The following examples illustrate this point.

(6) "Whether Sue could get extra instruction from Jean before the test" (a variant of ICS consideration #8).

(7) "Whether Sue could pass without cheating by 'cramming'."

Social standards such as fairness and honesty are often evoked in stage 3 reasoning.

Stage 4

(1) "Whether any real good could come to the school if copying on exams was practised" (ICS consideration #4).

Grade 7 to 10 students rarely construct stage 4 responses. Stage 4 considerations would deal with the issue of doing one's duty so as to maintain society (in this case, the social structure would be the school). The respondent might show a strong identification with social expectations and rules and might refer to the need to actively support achievement of good academic standards before a student were permitted to participate on school teams.

Stage 5

(1) "Whether it would go against the rights of other students to let Sue copy" (ICS consideration #5). Note how the orientation differs from example 3 of the stage 3 considerations.

Stage 5 considerations are rarely generated by adolescents. However, a number will select this consideration, some perhaps cueing on the word "rights." Stage 5 reasoning is concerned with general individual rights and standards which have been

critically examined and agreed upon by society as a whole or a particular segment, such as a school community. An agreed-upon "right" is a different matter from what is a "right" action as loosely defined by convention (and uncritically internalized as one matures away from a preconventional reasoning structure). From more adult respondents it may by hypothesized how any adolescent entering a postconventional stage would reason. He may see Jean's own opinion on the morality involved in letting Sue copy as important only as long as it refers to community standards. The possibility of getting rules changed so that Sue would not be put off the team if she fails the test might be mentioned.

Ambiguous Considerations

(1) "Whether Jean should take the chance to let Sue copy her." Variant: "Whether it was worth the risk" (Ambiguous stage 1 or 2). A case might be made that these are restatements of the dilemma, hence unscorable. However, students do not see it this way and give either stage 1 or stage 2 rationalizations for such utterances.

(2) "Whether Jean and Sue were willing to suffer the consequences" (Ambiguous stage 1 or 2). If, as is usually the case, a sense of "immanent justice" (the deed is wrong because it is going to be punished) prevails, then this is a stage 1 utterance. But it sometimes relates to potential disruption of the Sue - Jean relationship, as in several of the stage 2 examples given.

(3) "Whether her conscience agreed" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3). Compare this with the stage 3 consideration for "The Overdose" dilemma, "Whether if he killed him it would be on his conscience for the rest of his life." In the present example there is no clear inference that an act which is socially condemned is contemplated.

(4) "Whether Sue considered that this act is unfair to everyone." (Ambiguous stage

3 or 5). There is just not enough to determine the stage. The word "fair" enters children's vocabulary by age 3, so is little guide to the level of reasoning. From what is given, we cannot know the basis of "Sue considered," whether this means critical analysis or only an internalization of convention.

The ambiguous utterances mix conventional reasoning (notions of what is good, right, just, natural, proper, fair, etc.) and either (i) preconventional concern with individual satisfaction or need fulfillment or more rarely (ii) with emerging postconvention notions of principles such as justice or individual rights.

Unscorable Considerations

(1) "Whether it would do any good to cheat." "Good," like "fair" creeps into vocabularies at any early age and is no clear indication of moral reasoning structure.

(2) "Whether Sue would only copy one or two answers." Looking for more data or a way to soften or resolve the dilemma by speculating "what if ..." is common but not exclusive to stage 3 reasoning.

(3) "Whether Sue cheats constantly on tests." See (2) above and note difference from example 6, stage 2.

(4) "Whether Sue would have done well had she not been absent." Again, a desire to clarify or manipulate situational variables seems to be in evidence.

Story II

THE OVERDOSE

An elderly man was slowly dying of a very painful disease for which there seemed to be no cure. The man's son was a doctor and he gave his father as large a dose of pain-killer as was safe. At last even a dose that great could not ease the terrible agony. The man begged for a deadly overdose of the pain-killing drug to put him out of his suffering.

The doctor considered giving his father the overdose.

THE OVERDOSE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
3	1. Whether the family is in favour of giving the overdose			
3	2. Whether the doctor is bound by the same law as everyone else and must not kill people			
K	3. Whether God and the law would be in conflict if society kept alive by force those who want to die			
4	4. Whether all elderly and ill persons would be endangered if society permitted such actions			
2	5. Whether the overdose could be made to look like an accident or suicide			
1	6. Whether the doctor might be punished for causing his father's death			
K	7. Whether the right to die overrides the medical obligation to society's behavior			
5	8. Whether one can ever justify ending any human life			
	9. Whether _____ _____			
	10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story II -- The Overdose: Examples of Considerations

Stage 1

(1) "Whether the doctor might be punished for causing his father's death" (ICS consideration #6). Variants will stress (or at least clearly infer) that the act is wrong because it will be punished, e.g., "Whether the doctor realized he would inevitably be punished." Particular punishments may be suggested (jail, loss of licence, civil actions, "revenge," etc.)

(2) "Whether the doctor can disobey his father: his father can tell him what to do." Variant: "Whether the dying man's wife agrees: she's the doctor's mother and he has to obey her."

Virtually all stage 1 reasoning on this issue of "life" revolves about inevitable punishment (or prospects for avoiding it) or absolute deference to an authority, such as the power of parents over children or God over all men. The merely prudential consideration of the possible consequences of ending a life does not in itself necessarily reflect a stage 1 moral reasoning structure. It is the definition of terminating a life as "wrong" because it is punished that distinguishes the preconventional mode of thought. Some invoke "Thou shalt not kill" as an absolute authority.

Stage 2

(1) "Whether the overdose could be made to look like an accident or suicide" (ICS consideration #5). Variant: "Whether there is a better way of killing him to end his pain, and covering up."

(2) "Whether the son should run the risks because of his father's wishes."

(3) "Whether the doctor should give the overdose because of his father's great pain."

(4) "Whether the overdose would actually kill, or just put him in more pain."

Variant: "Whether the overdose would make something else worse and hurt even more."

(5) "Whether the money spent to keep the old man alive would be better spent elsewhere, since he would die soon anyway."

Stage 2 considerations reflect the reasoning that right action is that which meets your needs and occasionally the needs of others too. Such reasoning as applied to the present genre of dilemma is stated well in Porter and Taylor How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students (1972):

> "A human life is valuable when it satisfies the needs of its possessor. In this case, it is a life of pain, without satisfaction, and so it is not valued. The decision as to whether to (overdose) is up to the (dying patient)." p. 25.

Stage 3

(1) "Whether the family is in favour of giving the overdose" (ICS consideration #1).

Variants: "Whether the doctor got consent from (family, the courts, other doctors) and everyone agreed this was right to do." Note that this is neither the same thing as unquestioning deference to authority (stage 1) nor is it the stage 5 socio-legal consensus approach.

(2) "Whether the doctor is bound by the same law as everyone else and must not kill people" (ICS consideration #2). Variant: "Whether it would be legal."

(3) "Whether it is the doctor's responsibility to end the man's pain." (Compare this with "Whether the doctor had any legal authority to kill him" and "Whether the doctor thinks he has the right to take away the man's life," both also stage 3 reasoning but with different emphases -- duty, law, right).

(4) "Whether a cure could be found in the near future." Variants: "Whether the father might change his mind or be talked out of suicide"; "Whether it is 100% certain that the old man would soon die."

(5) "Whether if he killed him it would be on his conscience for life." Note that here it is inferred that killing is wrong, but in example 3 of the ambiguous considerations for the Teammate story there is no clear inference.

(6) "Whether it is wrong for a doctor to kill a patient he is supposed to be helping."

(7) "Whether the doctor's other patients (colleagues, etc.) would think terribly of him."

(8) "Whether the doctor is compassionate toward his father's agony."

Stage 3 reasoning comprehends that the issue of human life is of great importance. It recognizes that society has a strong interest in the matter. Stage 3 reasoning views taking a life as "wrong" by social definition and yet is able to sympathize with the agony of the dying man (and, in most cases, with the agony of the son). Responses may focus on the possibility of a cure being found or of other changed circumstances that would obviate the extremely difficult moral dilemma. Occasionally Biblical citations may be given (not as an absolute injunction as in stage 1 reasoning) as an indicator of how "right" action is socially defined.

Stage 4

(1) "Whether all elderly and ill persons would be endangered if society permitted such actions" (ICS consideration #4). Variant: "Whether mercy killing is a greater threat to society then is justified by relief from painful terminal illness."

(2) "Whether by violating his sacred oath to preserve life the doctor undermines society's efforts to make better lives for all."

Stage 4 considerations show concern for the maintenance of social order, for doing one's duty for the sake of society, and for conforming to laws, rules, oaths, agreements, etc., which hold society together in a harmonious and constructive, if imperfect, way.

Stage 5

(1) "Whether one can ever justify ending any human life" (ICS consideration #8). Variant: "Whether helping end a life is ever a responsible act of cooperation."

Stage 5 reasoning may be legalistic, but it takes into great account concepts such as the sanctity of life and society's need to sustain the life of all its members.

K Statements

(1) "Whether God and the law would be in conflict if society kept alive by force those who want to die" (ICS consideration #3).

(2) "Whether the right to die overrides the medical obligation to society's behavior" (ICS consideration #7).

The human mind, with its wonderful complexity, strives to bring order out of chaos. Try as they might, most minds can't find much sense in these doubletalk utterances. Some seem to cue on "God" or "law" or "society" or "right," however. See pages 10-11 on "Kangaroo (K)" statements.

Ambiguous Considerations

(1) "Whether the man and his son, the doctor, 'were close'" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(2) "Whether the father has any right (was fair) in asking his son to break the law." (While this appears to be stage 3, stage 2 rationalizations have been given in support of such utterances.)

(3) "Whether the father has any consideration for his son to ask him to break the law." (As in example 2 which this closely resembles, either stage 3 or stage 2 perspectives can be found in support of this genre of consideration. What is lacking is a clear stage 3 social perspective in students who would give such responses.

Unscorable Considerations

(1) "Whether the doctor could give enough morphine to kill the pain." (Example of attempt to re-model the story facts without indicating any clear moral stance.)

(2) "Whether the man would kill himself some other way" (speculation beyond the story data).

(3) "Whether his father would prefer to die with dignity." Variant: "Whether the old man's right to die was prevented by artificial means (man-made life-support systems)." Such responses are probably reflections of recent news items; the students have the vocabulary but little or no moral position is found clearly explicated in such utterances.

(4) "Whether a quick, easy death is preferable to a slow, painful death" (a variant statement of one aspect of the dilemma).

Story III

THE CLASS SALE

A class asked the school principal for permission to hold a sale of articles they all made in their Industrial Arts and Home Economics courses. He said, "OK, but first work out all arrangements with your home room teacher." The students agreed that any profit would be divided equally among all class members. Their teacher approved of this agreement.

The sale made a lot of money and the next day a problem arose. Several students thought that the profits should be shared differently than first agreed upon. All the students met in private to decide what to do.

Some thought that a bigger share of the profits should go to students whose articles brought the highest prices or to those who worked hardest and longest to make and sell the items. Someone suggested that all the money should be spent on a class party or a trip. Give all the money to charity, said a student, or to the poorer students in the class, said another. Some said the original agreement should be kept.

You wonder what might happen if the original agreement were changed by your class.

THE CLASS SALE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
2	1. Whether you would get less money if the original agreement was changed			
3	2. Whether anyone's feelings would be hurt if the original agreement was changed			
1	3. Whether the teacher would be furious if the original agreement was changed			
5	4. Whether anyone's rights would be acted against by changing from the original agreement			
3	5. Whether you should vote for what you really believe, no matter what			
1	6. Whether the principal might punish the class for changing the original agreement			
2	7. Whether a good friend might be angry if you voted to change the agreement			
4	8. Whether a valued school tradition might be broken if a class went back on an agreement			
	9. Whether _____ _____			
	10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story III -- The Class Sale: Examples of Considerations

Stage 1

(1) "Whether the teacher would be furious if the original agreement was changed" (ICS consideration #3). Variants include any concern for punitive action (e.g., the class might lose privileges) from an authority figure (teacher, principal) but no reference is made either to generally accepted rules of behavior or to the social relationship (e.g., class-teacher) which might be violated by a unilateral change in the agreement (cf. stage 3 reasoning).

(2) "Whether the principal might punish the class for changing the original agreement" (ICS consideration #6). As in the example above (1), here concern is for punishment or for the authority figure's power rather than for relationships (as established in the original agreement). Stage 1 reasoning is indicated. Note: there is some indication that students who are into the conventional level also choose this item, viewing it as a prudential, rather than moral consideration or who feel that the words "for changing the agreement" clearly infers "a breach of contract, contrary to what is right to do." This item therefore needs further study and possibly should be revised by re-writing or by re-assignment as stage 3.

(3) "Whether some members of the class would get into trouble for voting the way they did."

(4) "Whether their parents will be angry (and punish) when they find out about the change."

(5) "Whether the school should take the situation in hand and tell the class what to do."

Stage 1 reasoning focuses on the immanence of physically distasteful outcomes which arise from bucking authorities. There is no indication that the authorities might cooperate in changing the agreement or may even approve of a change for a "good" reason. In short, there is no notion of give-and-take social relationships, only of the absoluteness of the power of authorities.

Stage 2

(1) "Whether you would get less money if the original agreement was changed" (ICS consideration #1). Variants: "Whether you'll end up with nothing you want"; "Whether your interests wouldn't be served by a new agreement"; "Whether your side didn't get what it wants."

(2) "Whether a good friend might be angry if you voted to change the agreement" (ICS consideration #7). But "Whether making a new agreement would start a fight" is at best ambiguous and is probably unscorable. Interesting variants from students have included "Whether you would be considered 'public enemy 1' due to your decision" and "Whether the money gets given to somebody you hate most."

Strong self-interest, in a fairly concrete form, is what generally typifies stage 2 reasoning in this "distributive" or "positive justice" dilemma. Right action is defined in terms of individual need satisfaction and is devoid of social definitions of appropriate action.

Stage 3

(1) "Whether anyone's feelings would be hurt if the original agreement was changed" (ICS consideration #2). Variants stress either primary concern for another person "being done wrong" in some tangible sense (a common example: "cheated out of what they earned") or some psychological manner ("whether a poorer student would

feel out of place if given the money"). A standard of socially-acceptable behavior is explicit or clearly implied in either case.

(2) "Whether you should vote for what you really believe in, no matter what" (ICS consideration #5). The notions of conscience and principle may be evolving, but there is no clear indication that this is more than a cliché. The many variants all lack consideration of the "facts of the story," e.g., that a contract has been made that calls for a counterbalancing of personal and social elements, as is found in a stage 5 utterance which might also treat of conscience and principle (see the given examples).

(3) "Whether the students could talk with the teachers (and principal) and get their OK for a new agreement that everyone else liked too." Note that authority is understood to exist, but as a partner to an agreement which can be altered by common consent for a "good" cause. In this example, we can see how stage 3 reasoning subsumes earlier perception of authority and self-interest into a structure which also adds an appreciation of social definitions of what is "fair", etc.

(4) "Whether fellow schoolmates would wonder if the class had any honour"; "Whether people would see your actions as ethical"; "Whether your teacher would think well of the class's action" and other variants show the stage 3 concern for the good opinion of others and a desire to be seen to have good intentions.

In stage 3, the social perspective is extended in order to view events through the eyes of some social unit (family, class, school, etc.). There is a desire for the approbation of whatever social unit(s) one identifies positively with general societal standards of what is good, just, fair, natural, respectable, trustworthy, and admirable may be referred to as criteria of "right" action.

Stage 4

(1) "Whether a valued school tradition might be broken if a class went back on an agreement" (ICS consideration #8). Variants: "Whether a broken agreement leads to a broken class (school)"; "Whether an agreement is an agreement and should not be changed if it leads to the belief that agreements are made to be broken."

(2) "Whether one could expect to keep agreements in later life, if one compromises now."

In stage 4 reasoning, agreements (laws, rules, etc.) are seen as the cement which holds society together. Rules and agreements must be kept because society and its needs are more important than individuals and their needs. The status quo must be maintained against change, especially institutional change. The individual must do his duty, not compromise, and build a more secure society.

Stage 5

(1) "Whether anyone's rights would be acted against by changing from the original agreement" (ICS consideration #4).

(2) "Whether it was possible to get everyone to consent freely to a new agreement which would be personally and socially helpful."

Stage 5 responses are rarely constructed by adolescents. Stage 5 incorporates stage 4 concerns for the common (social) good. But, in the absence of any "clear and present dangers" individuals may cooperate to change society in order to improve its function in keeping with principles of human conduct and agreed-upon ultimate life goals. Diversity of interests and values are presumed to exist, and accepted, by stage 5 reasoning.

Ambiguous Considerations

(1) "Whether the teacher would mind if they change the agreement" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(2) "Whether the money would be spent against someone's will" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(3) "Whether your friends got cheated and you didn't" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(4) "Whether those who received more money were popular or disliked" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

Unscorable Considerations

(1) "Whether they made a lot or little money."

(2) "Whether the vote was the best idea (or fair)."

(3) "Whether the students, if they kept the old agreement, would spend the money wisely."

(4) "Whether the students should ...." (a new solution is offered but no clear indication of the moral rationale for the proposal).

Story IV

ROCK CONCERT

Diane, aged 13, wanted to attend the rock concert which was coming to town.

Her mother gave Diane permission to go if she could pay for it herself. Diane saved enough from doing chores and babysitting, plus $5 more.

But her mother changed her mind and said that any money Diane saved would have to go toward the new clothes she wanted.

Diane decided to go to the concert anyway. She turned over only $5 for clothes and then asked her mother if she could spend that night with a friend. Her mother agreed but Diane went to the rock concert instead.

The next day Diane told Samantha, her 16-year-old sister, all that had happened.

Samantha was very concerned. She wondered whether she should talk with her mother.

ROCK CONCERT

What do YOU think is important for Samantha to consider?

Please write your thoughts in the spaces provided. Write in only important or very important considerations.

After you have written in these considerations, please select the three most important and identify these in the space provided at the foot of the page.

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE · SOME	IMPORTANCE · GREAT
1. Whether _____		
2. Whether _____		
3. Whether _____		
4. Whether _____		
5. Whether _____		

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story IV -- Rock Concert: Examples of Considerations

Stage 1

(1) "Whether Samantha's mother would punish her for not telling about Diane when the truth comes out." Variants assume that the mother will find out and take punitive action.

(2) "Whether Samantha could talk to her mother and keep Diane from being punished too severely."

Stage 1 reasoning on this dilemma revolves almost exclusively around the physical consequences for Diane or Samantha when the mother finds out what has occured. The assumption is that Diane will be punished physically or symbolically ("grounded," or "have to pay the money back"). There is no recognition of mother's role in leading Diane to challenge her authority.

Stage 2

(1) "Whether Samantha should ask mother if she minded if Diane went to the concert anyway, then tell her if she didn't really mind."

(2) "Whether the lies Diane told her mother would be good for her in the future."

(3) "Whether Diane was right because she had earned the money herself."

(4) "Whether Diane would repeat her deception unless Samantha did something."

(5) "Whether Diane and her mother were on good terms."

(6) "Whether Diane felt no harm could come to her or her mother from attending the concert." Variant: "Whether Diane felt going to the concert was in her best interest."

(7) "Whether Diane wanted to go to the concert more than buying new clothes."

(8) "Whether Diane would be grateful and generous to Samantha if she didn't tell." Variant: "Whether Samantha could blackmail Diane."

(9) "Whether the mother had been unfair so Diane was justified in going to the concert."

The major concern of stage 2 reasoning applied to this dilemma is the satisfaction of Diane's or Samantha's needs. Students reasoning at stage 2 make considerations by putting themselves in either the sister's shoes or the mother's, then reasoning from there. Instrumental relativism prevails. Notions of deterring repeated misdemeanours are rooted in self-interest, not social well-being. The stage 2 thinker believes in absolute right to what one earns and does not accept as legitimate a parent's authority to determine the disposition of Diane's earnings. If it is perceived that the mother had hurt Diane's interests, then Diane may reciprocate by lying: tit-for-tat is fair to stage 2 reasoning because it serves one's needs.

Stage 3

(1) "Whether Diane had told Samantha in strict confidence." Variants: "Whether Diane would ever be able to trust Samantha if she told her secret" or "Whether the trusting relationship (between the sisters, between mother and daughters) would be destroyed."

(2) "Whether Samantha thought it was wrong for Diane to deceive people, whatever the justification."

(3) "Whether a sister ought to care about a sister and what she does."

(4) "Whether it was fair to spend money on a concert if it was needed for clothes."

(5) "Whether Diane in fact wished to come to some understanding with her mother on the situation." Variants: "Whether good relationships could be restored

between Diane and her mother"; "Whether Samantha felt she could do some good by raising the matter with her mother"; "Whether Samantha could help both parties see how they'd wronged the other."

Stage 3 reasoning goes beyond individual needs to state or imply general beliefs as to what is expected and acceptable in social relationships, such as mother - daughter, sister - sister. Reconciling differences is seen as constructive in the social context as well as serving all parties' individual needs (at least in part). The stage 2 capacity for taking individual perspectives one at a time or reciprocally is enlarged in stage 3 to provide a (sometimes unexamined) social definition of the situation. This prepares the way for a more mature recognition of the interplay of individual and group as in stages 4, 5, and 6.

Stage 4

(1) "Whether Samantha should tell her mother that Diane disobeyed, in order to show respect for her authority and responsibility as a mother, not because her mother was right in what she did."

(2) "Whether Samantha's decision should be based on her recognition of her duty as a family member to work for family harmony." Variant: "Whether Samantha feels responsible enough about family relationships to get the issues out in the open."

(3) "Whether not telling would imply to Diane that society can tolerate deceit, which would be dangerous for Diane and society."

Stage 4 reasoning is uncommon in younger adolescents but might be inferred, as above, from adult responses. Duty, family cohesiveness, or maintenance of social integrity might be stressed.

Stage 5

(1) "Whether children owe parents absolute obedience -- either in positive or restrictive duties -- or only respect and confidence -- must be an important principle on which the relationship will be defined."

(2) "Whether the mother's actions in this situation have compromised the normal obligation of children to parents."

(3) "Whether Diane has reached a degree of self-sufficiency and independence of values which ought to be matched by a degree of toleration and respect by her mother of her daughter's values and decisions.

Stage 5 reasoning might be expected to be concerned not just with maintaining social relationships by appeals to "duty" but with building better institutional frameworks to maximize human potential. Hence the recognition of a mother's responsibilities and authority would be complemented by a recognition of the 13-year-old's emerging competencies (to earn money, to get to and return safely from a rock concert) and personal value set. The attempt to reconcile the rights of a parent and the rights a young person has (rights as a human being, not necessarily legal rights) on some principled basis might characterize stage 5 reasoning.

Ambiguous Considerations

(1) "Whether any harm had really come of it" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(2) "Whether Diane goes out very often -- it would be unfair not to let her go when other kids her age can." (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3 as it seems rooted in needs satisfaction with just a touch of social definition of right action: the matter hangs on what is meant by "unfair."

(3) "Whether Diane should have to pay for her own clothes" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3).

(4) "Whether it is any of Samantha's business" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3) Cf. this with example 2 of the stage 4 considerations.

(5) "Whether Diane is old enough to make her own decisions" (Ambiguous stage 2 or 3). Cf. this with example 3 of the stage 5 considerations.

(6) "Whether Samantha has the right to judge her sister's actions" (Ambiguous stage 3 or 4, the latter if a sense of duty is inferred).

(7) "Whether Diane should disobey her mother even if her mother is wrong" (Ambiguous stage 3 or 4: this may be a variant on example 1 of the stage 4 considerations or perhaps, like many ambiguous statements, indicates that thinking is in transition from stage to stage).

Unscorable Considerations

(1) "Whether Diane and her mother had decided together on whether Diane should go to the concert" (Other attempts to re-shape the data given in the story include "Whether her mother really meant ALL the money she'd saved be put toward clothing" and "Whether the price of the concert was greater than or less than five dollars").

(2) "Whether Samantha ought to tell on Diane" (A common restatement of the dilemma without any indication of moral reasoning).

(3) "Whether it would do any good to tell because Diane had already seen the concert" (In an interview one might tease out whether this was a stage 1 or 2 or 3 or ... but as a written utterance it is just too open-ended to characterize).

(4) "Whether Diane should tell her mother herself" (Sometimes a possible resolution of

Samantha's problem is bumped back to Diane. This is one common way in which "solutions" rather than considerations are offered by respondents).

THE FORCED-CHOICE FORMAT: FORM 78FC

This form is recommended when one or more of four conditions exist. It is suitable when one wishes only to estimate whether a respondent is substantially into the conventional level of moral reasoning, as defined by Kohlberg, rather than probing the upper limits of a respondent's moral reasoning as does FORM A. FORM 78FC is recommended when the respondent is somewhat inarticulate or for other reasons not able or likely to write his own considerations as in the open-ended format. Use 78FC when time is at a premium: this form requires only half the time (about 20 minutes) that the open-ended format demands (40 minutes minimum). Finally, and perhaps most important, as this form does not require knowledge of developmental theory in order to score the responses, an "untrained" scorer may be employed.

A typical use for FORM 78FC might be at the beginning of the school year with a new class of grade 7 or 8 students for whom there is no information available with respect to their moral reasoning power. The teacher might wish to estimate how many, if any, students have internalized "conventional morality" (stage 3) as the major mode of moral reasoning. If there is not time to administer and to score FORM A or if the teacher does not feel competent to score the students' composed responses, FORM 78FC would be indicated.

FORM 78FC resembles FORM A in many respects and is, of course, based on the same developmental model. FORM 78FC presents the same sample story and the same four dilemma decision stories. For each of the first three stories, 12 considerations are presented to the respondent rather than the eight given considerations as in FORM A. There is no space provided for respondent-generated considerations in FORM 78FC. The "reception format" after Story IV differs totally between the two forms: FORM 78FC presents 12

considerations rather than requiring respondents to construct a number of their own.

As in FORM A, the respondent is to rate each of the considerations in terms of its importance or he may indicate "do not understand." The desirability, perhaps even necessity, of this additional column rests upon the assumption that this form may be used with respondents who have somewhat less than average language skills. It is to be expected that all respondents might not understand Kangaroos (K) statements or considerations expressed two or more stages above their principal stage. But where a respondent consistently checks more than half the considerations as "do not understand" then possibly (assuming the respondent is acting in good faith) this survey is not a suitable means of evoking information about moral reasoning power from this respondent.

Having rated the considerations, the respondent to FORM 78FC proceeds to rank the three most important, as in FORM A. Here it is worth commenting upon another possible reason for incorporating a "do not understand" column. The presence of a fourth column seems to inhibit a mistake in procedure made by a few respondents to FORM A, which has only three columns. These few respondents appear to have totalled the number of check marks in the first column on the right ("Great Importance") and put the total in the first box ("Most Important Consideration"). A similar procedure led to totals being put in the other two boxes. If the addition of the fourth column does check this mistake, FORM A may be revised accordingly in future editions.

Careful examination of FORM 78FC will reveal more subtle differences from FORM A which result from the field trials of FORM A (which was developed first of the two formats).

Some changes are merely economies in wording or changes in keeping with the vocabularies of younger respondents.

Some changes in sequence of given considerations were necessitated by the introduction

into each panel of Kangaroo (K) statements, of more preconventional utterances, and the elimination of postconventional statements. Although the effect of the position in the sequence of given considerations is unknown (do respondents tend to favor considerations which appear first or early in the distribution? or perhaps last?), it was thought best to provide a randomness to the stage distribution of considerations.

Scoring

The forced-choice format eliminates ambiguous and unscorable statements (excepting, one might argue, for the inherent and intended ambiguity and kangarooism built into the survey).

The calculation of a moral reasoning score proceeds as in FORM A (see page 18) on a tally sheet built into page one of FORM 78FC.

One first enters the by-stage data for each story. Then the sum of considerations at each stage is recorded in Column "A" of the tally and the total entered at the foot of the column under "(A)".

Then one multiplies the sum of the considerations chosen at each stage (as found in Column "A") by the numerical value of that stage (e.g., stage 2 has a numeric value of 2) and the products are entered in Column "B". Total Column "B" and enter the sum at the foot of the column under "(B)".

Finally, use the formula MRS $=\frac{(B)}{(A)} \times 100$. That is, divide the total of Column "B" by the total of Column "A" and then multiply by 100. Column "A" will normally equal 12 unless one or more K statements were chosen. K choices do not figure into the scoring. The result, rounded if necessary, is an estimate of the respondent's Moral Reasoning Score or MRS. In the given specimen, from a grade 8 student, the MRS is "227" (25 ÷ 11 x 100).

SPECIMEN: MRS Tally Sheet, Level 2, FORM 78FC

	I	II	III	IV	A	B	PC
1		1			1	1	9
2	2	1	2	1	6	12	55
3	1		1	2	4	12	36
4							
K		1			(A) 11	(B) 25	

$$MRS = \frac{(B)}{(A)} \times 100$$

$$= \frac{25}{11} \times 100 = 227$$

As the Column "PC" (per cent) shows, only 36 per cent of the respondent's scorable selections (4 of 11) were stage 3 considerations. More than half (7 of 11 or 64 per cent) of the scorable selections were at the preconventional level (55 per cent at stage 2). This student is receptive to conventional moral reasoning and is responding "conventionally" across three dilemmas. But his major mode is preconventional stage 2.

Given such data on an individual, a teacher could pitch a dilemma dialogue with this person at stage 3, but could expect to hear some considerable preconventional reasoning presented.

Given a class of students with a distribution of reasoning stages as for the specimen case, a teacher could anticipate that some stage 3 reasoning would come from students without

prodding and also that the students would be somewhat responsive to a stage 3 approach by the teacher. It is not likely that stage 4 or higher reasoning would be generated by such a class, nor would they likely respond insightfully to stage 4 reasoning.

Guide to the Scoring of Each Story

The four dilemma stories are identical in the two formats. Story I appears on page 20, II on page 27, III on 34, and IV on 41 of this manual.

On the following pages the "reception format" for the considerations for each story is presented, but in a slightly cropped form. Since FORM 78FC is printed on stock $8\frac{1}{2}$ by 13 inches, unlike FORM A which is $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 inches, it is not convenient to reproduce it exactly. The decision was to reproduce everything except the bottom section where respondents would rank-order their three most important considerations. This section is virtually identical to that as shown on page 21, 28, 35, and 41 where the "reception formats" for FORM A are reproduced.

To these truncated specimen pages has been added the stage score for each of the given considerations.

TECHNICAL DATA

Field trials of FORM A have been conducted principally in York County Board of Education elementary and secondary schools but also in schools of the Scarborough, North York, Halton, and Hamilton Boards of Education. Over 2,200 students from grades 7 through 13 were involved. FORM 78FC has been tried with over 400 students in grades 5 through 8 in York County with the last small-scale trials still proceeding at time of writing, June 1976.

Throughout the trials attention has been given to the questions of the validity and

STORY I -- TEAMMATES

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE: Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
K	1. Whether it is fair to Sue's constitutional relationships.				
1	2. Whether Christine might be caught and given a failing mark for letting Sue copy.				
4	3. Whether any real good would come to the school if copying on exams was practised.				
1	4. Whether Christine might be caught and her mother would find out.				
3	5. Whether it was fair of the teacher to make Sue take the test so soon after a long absence.				
2	6. Whether the volleyball team really meant a lot to Sue.				
3	7. Whether it is fair to other students who were also away.				
2	8. Whether it would do Sue any good to copy.				
K	9. Whether society has the right to take advantage of Christine's previous ineptitude.				
1	10. Whether Christine would be dropped from the team if she was caught letting Sue copy.				
3	11. Whether Sue could get extra help and learn enough math to pass.				
2	12. Whether Christine and Sue were really close friends.				

STORY II -- THE OVERDOSE

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE: Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1	1. Whether the doctor might lose his job because the authorities will find out sooner or later.				
K	2. Whether the right to die overrides the medical obligation to society's behavior.				
1	3. Whether the doctor might be sent to jail for breaking the law.				
2	4. Whether the drug could be left within the reach of the dying father so he could take the overdose by himself.				
3	5. Whether the family is in favour of giving the overdose.				
2	6. Whether the son should risk his own life because of his father's wishes.				
3	7. Whether the hospital should make the decision.				
3	8. Whether the doctor is bound by the same law against killing as everyone else.				
4	9. Whether all elderly and ill persons would be endangered if society permitted such actions.				
2	10. Whether it is best for the father to have the overdose because he is going to die anyway.				
K	11. Whether honesty and the law would be in conflict if the doctor made a decision from a normative base.				
1	12. Whether the doctor might be punished for causing his father's death.				

STORY III -- CLASS SALE

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE: Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
2	1. Whether your interests would be hurt by a new agreement.				
3	2. Whether you should vote for what you really believe, no matter what.				
3	3. Whether anyone's feelings would be hurt if the original agreement was changed.				
1	4. Whether the teacher would punish the class when he finally found out the agreement was changed.				
2	5. Whether you would get less money if the original agreement was changed.				
3	6. Whether someone who worked really hard would be cheated out of their share.				
K	7. Whether a penny saved is a penny earned.				
2	8. Whether a good friend might be angry if you voted to change the agreement.				
1	9. Whether the class wouldn't be allowed to hold another sale.				
K	10. Whether any new agreement would morally persuade the original agreement.				
4	11. Whether one would be able to keep an agreement later on in life, if he compromises now.				
1	12. Whether the principal would blame the teacher when the agreement was changed.				

STORY IV -- ROCK CONCERT

Stage	CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE: Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1	1. Whether Diane would be punished by her parents.				
3	2. Whether the mother was concerned about Diane's best interests.				
2	3. Whether the lies Diane told her mother would be good for her in the future.				
1	4. Whether the mother would make Diane pay the money back.				
K	5. Whether Samantha should not tell her mother because if she told her, indeed, she would be.				
2	6. Whether Diane has to make up her own mind because it is her money.				
K	7. Whether Diane had a platonic underlying relationship with her friend.				
3	8. Whether Diane's mother was justified in going back on an agreement.				
4	9. Whether arrangements made between two family members should be placed ahead of the well-being of the whole family.				
1	10. Whether Samantha would be punished for not telling her mother right away.				
3	11. Whether Samantha should break the confidence between her and her sister.				
2	12. Whether Diane would do it again if Samantha didn't tell their mother.				

reliability (especially measurement error) of the ICS. While the ICS formats were in rapid development in 1974 and 1975, the data gave indication of needed changes. The FORM A trial edition of March 1976 (0376) is the fifth version and has, in fact, only been administered to about 750 students in all, and only tried in York County. The present FORM 78FC also has not been used outside York County. Existing technical data on validity and reliability must therefore be viewed as only tentative indications of the answers to questions such as: "What evidence is there that the ICS measures what the ICS purports to measure?"

Norms, too, can only be based on a numerically and geographically limited population, and although all the varied communities of the York Region were included in the field tests, no claim is made for the generalizability of present findings to, for example, "inner city" populations. Broader trials are indicated and recommended, perhaps after some further polishing of both formats.

These points notwithstanding, what do the preliminary analyses of the ICS suggest about validity, reliability, inter-scorer concordance and normative scores?

From our limited data base, there does not appear to be enough difference in mean average moral reasoning scores (MRS) over a period of one year to warrant autumn and spring norms. Measurement error alone could account for what appears to be "development" over the 12-month period from grade 7 to grade 8 (spring 1975 to spring 1976) in a cohort with which we used FORM A. This may not be the case in later grades or with FORM 78FC, but more data, preferably from a province-wide standardization of the two formats, is required. Analysis of variance of data from our grade 7 (369 students) and grade 9 (369 students) trials in 1975-1976 showed that the means (263, 272) were significantly different (.01). Sex differences in favor of girls showed up as significant at .05, but sex by grade did not interact.

Based on the various trials of ICS FORM A we can offer tentative norms expressed as MRS.

ICS FORM A INDIVIDUAL NORMS, AS MRS

Grade	Females	Males	Mean
7	260	253	257
8	263	256	260
9	271	267	269
10	281	276	279
11	290	283	287
12/13	315	312	314

Indications, from an analysis of grade 7 scores only, are that norms for FORM 78FC will be scaled much lower.

From looking at the normative data we can see that MRS correlates with age, varying directly with age, when we look at averages. But age alone was not a good predictor in a sample of 144 students in grades 7 and 8 classes. When age is used along with an academic achievement measure (scores on the reading battery of the Canadian Tests of Basic Skills) about 15 per cent of the variance is accounted for.

In the autumn of 1975, 406 grade 9-10 students (the 37 grade 10 students were all also taking one or more grade 9 classes) tried ICS FORM A. In the spring of 1976, 369 grade 7 students responded to FORM A. The secondary students were from 14 high schools and the elementary students were in 13 different public schools. From these trials, tentative by-school norms can be put forward so that a teacher or principal could see his school's MRS in perspective.

ICS FORM A SCHOOL NORMS, AS MRS

Percentile	Grade 7 (Spring)	Grade 9-10 (Autumn)
1st	251	259
25th	258	265
50th	263	271
75th	266	277
99th	271	290

The validity of the ICS has not yet been established. As noted above, the ICS is measuring something other than, or in addition to, age and reading skills. The ICS purports to measure moral reasoning after the fashion of Kohlberg's model and should, therefore, yield scores similar to those obtained from use of Kohlberg's Decision Story as a written battery or in a clinical interview. When a class of 30 grade 9 students took both the Decision Story written battery and the ICS FORM A, the latter yielded a higher mean MRS and the rank-order correlation was only about +0.15. Whether the written battery "contaminated" the ICS or whether the slight differences in issues and concerns account for this (or whether other variables might enter) cannot be known from this one trial. A second trial, with 15 grade 7 students, compared MRS derived from an interview and from the ICS FORM A. The 15 chosen for interviews were selected from a larger poll of grade 7 students who had taken FORM A. The 15 were drawn across the full range of scores. The correlation of the ICS with interview scores, $r_{12} = +0.45$, is not high, even if the differences in issues and concerns between the two surveys is reckoned into the balance.

Reliability and measurement error studies must go beyond what has been done to

date, especially test-retest studies. One trial conducted with a cohort of 30 students looked at stability of the FORM A over a 12-month period (spring 1975 to spring 1976) and produced a test-retest correlation of .61, significant at 0.05. Internal consistency was checked. Hoyt's (1941) analysis of variance was used to test internal consistency of FORM A in samples of 50 each drawn from the last two trials. It found, at grade 9, $r = +0.34$; at grade 7, $r = +0.31$. When, as is recommended in this current manual, unsupported stage 5 selections were reclassified as stage 3 (for the grade 7 samples), then $r = +0.44$. Obviously, if stage 5 considerations are being read as stage 3 by less mature respondents, there is a considerable impact on internal consistency.

An item analysis was performed on FORM A. A random sample of the grade 7 papers was drawn and from that sample, the lowest scoring 27 per cent (N = 56) and the highest scoring 27 per cent (N = 56) were identified. The "performance" of the two groups on each item was tabulated and their manner in which they handled write-ins was studied. This exercise shed light on questions we have often been asked:

Q. "Do high-scoring students selected Kangaroo (K) statements more often than low scorers?"

A. "No, in fact high scorers probably select K statements just slightly less frequently than do low scorers, but the difference is not significant."

Q. "Do low scorers write more unscorable considerations?"

A. "Yes, but the difference is marginal and insignificant."

Q. "Do low scorers write more ambiguous considerations than higher scorers?"

A. "Of the ambiguity which could not be resolved by context scoring, low scorers generated slightly more than their share, but there were only 18 such statements in all, so no meaningful difference exists in this sample."

Q. "Is there any general category or stage of given considerations which fails to discriminate between high and lower scorers?"

A. "Yes: as you might expect from the literature, grade 7 students are principally using stage 2 moral reasoning, and hence stage 2 considerations have low discriminating power. Strangely, respondents from grade 7 on up tend to shy away from selecting given considerations which are at stage 2 but grade 7 students frequently generated stage 2 utterances as write-ins. But they produced even more stage 1 considerations, and yet even more stage 3 statements."

Inter-scorer concordance trials were run. In the first trial, one senior scorer (A), one experienced scorer (B), and two novices (C, D) each scored two sets of about 30 papers. Spearman rank-order correlations between A and B ran just under unity (+ 0.90 and + 0.93). Between the two more experienced and two less experienced the first batch of papers produced correlations running between + 0.40 and + 0.56. The second batch produced correlations in the + 0.60 to + 0.78 range. Mean differences in MRS was under 10 points in this second run.

A later trial with A, plus an experienced scorer (E), plus a novice scorer who was well grounded in theory (F), produced rank-order correlations at high levels: A and E at + 1.00; A and F at + 0.84; and E and F at + 0.79.

The principal source of difference is the "ambiguous" rather than "unscorable" respondent-generated considerations. Although the current manual has been revised to deal with the problem of assigning (or not assigning) a stage to "difficult" utterances, the solution is to concentrate on characterizing the style of thinking of each stage. There are actually fewer specific examples of unscorable and ambiguous considerations in this manual than its predecessor. But more attention is paid to explaining why

considerations are assigned (or not assigned) as they are.

No doubt some scorers will always be more prepared than others to relegate "difficult" considerations, written in by inarticulate respondents, to the unscorable category. Concordance could be increased, no doubt, by instructing scorers "When in doubt, throw it out!" But this might mean loss of useful data. More, it might also obviate those painful review sessions when scorers consult among themselves about the "meaning" of difficult to understand utterances. From such sessions real insights have emerged that help all to gain insight into the nature of the assessment task and the model we have of the styles of moral reasoning of young people.

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE ICS

On the following pages are reproduced the "Directions for Administrators" as designed for FORM A and for FORM 78FC.

The directions are sufficiently clear and complete enough to produce administrations which would duplicate original procedures. Departures from these directions are not recommended unless there is a compelling reason to do so. It is recognized that conditions might call for deviation from the outlines, however. For instance, in a trial of FORM 78FC with a grade 5 class in late June 1976, it was deemed advisable to have the class teacher read each story aloud then determine that there were no misunderstandings about the stories' content. Such a procedure might be used with grade 7 classes where many students were below average in reading.

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS OF THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

LEVEL 2, FORM A

Please read these directions before administering the ICS in order to familiarize yourself with the details.

The instructions you are to read to the students are enclosed in rectangles. Pause in appropriate places to give the students sufficient time to complete the assignment.

When you are ready to administer the ICS, say:

> Today you are asked to take part in a survey dealing with the many things people consider before making an important decision. You can write either with a pen or a pencil. I will pass out the booklets. Please do not write anything until asked to do so.

Distribute the booklets and pencils if needed. After the booklets have been distributed, say:

> On the title page in the places provided please PRINT your name, sex, age (in years and in months). Count the months from your last birthday until this month. Indicate the name of your school, your grade and today's date.

Write today's date on the blackboard. Allow sufficient time for writing in the information. Answer any questions that may come.

> Now open up the booklet. Read the directions on the first page while I read them aloud to you.

Read all of the first page (the students may read the story "The Trip" for themselves).

> Now look at the second page. Each consideration has been rated by a student in term of its importance. When it seemed very important to him, he marked his response in the column under "GREAT." When it seemed somewhat important, he marked his response under "SOME." When it wasn't important, he marked his response under "NONE."

Read consideration No. 1.

> The student completing this example didn't think that this consideration had any importance, so he marked its importance as "NONE."

Read consideration No. 2.

> In rating consideration 2, the student changed his mind; this is permissible at all times.

Read consideration No. 4.

> In consideration 4, the student possibly didn't understand the meaning of the statement. When you encounter a consideration that "doesn't make sense," mark its importance as "NONE."
>
> At the right side of the page, near the bottom, is a box divided into three. From the choices that the student made under the column "GREAT IMPORTANCE," he ranked number 3 as the most meaningful to him and wrote that number in the top section of the box. He then ranked number 8 as his second most important consideration. For his third choice he had to decide which of the considerations under the column of "SOME IMPORTANCE" meant the most to him. He selected number 5.
>
> You are asked to rate each of the four stories in the booklet in the same manner and rank the three most important considerations (including the ones you may have added). Check carefully that the numbers you write in the three boxes are the ones which correctly indicate the considerations most important to you. Check to make sure you made no errors in copying such numbers.
>
> Do you have any questions?

Answer questions.

> You have 20-25 minutes approximately to complete this survey. Now open your booklet and start reading Story 1. If you have a question while writing, raise your hand and I'll come to you. When you finish a story, go on to the next one. When all four stories are completed, if any time is left, check over your responses.

At the end of the period, collect all booklets and pencils, if given. Thank the students for their cooperation. Write on your copy of the survey any problem that may have arisen.

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS OF THE

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

LEVEL 2, FORM 78FC

Please read these directions before administering the ICS in order to familiarize yourself with the details.

The instructions you are to read to the students are enclosed in rectangles. Pause in appropriate places to give the students sufficient time to complete the assignment.

When you are ready to administer the ICS, say:

> Today you are asked to take part in a survey dealing with the many things people consider before making an important decision. You can write either with a pen or a pencil. I will pass out the booklets. Please do not write anything until asked to do so.

Distribute the booklets and pencils if needed. After the booklets have been distributed, say:

> On the title page in the places provided please PRINT your name, sex, age (in years and in months). Count the months from your last birthday until this month. Indicate the name of your school, your grade and today's date.

Write today's date on the blackboard. Allow sufficient time for writing in the information. Answer any questions that may come.

> Now open up the booklet. Please read the directions on the top of the first page while I read them aloud to you.

Have the students read the story "The Trip" for themselves. Then say:

> I am going to give you the directions for doing this survey. You need not make notes. Step number 1 and 2 on the Directions page are reminders of what is to be done and you can return to them any time you need to refresh your memory.
>
> Now look at the next page. Each consideration has been rated by a student in term of its importance. When it seemed very important to him, he marked his response in the column under "GREAT." When it seemed somewhat important, he marked his response under "SOME." When it wasn't important, he marked his response under "NONE." When he didn't understand it, he marked his response under "DO NOT UNDERSTAND."

Read consideration No. 1.

> The student completing this example didn't think that this consideration had any importance, so he marked its importance as "NONE."

Read consideration No. 2.

> In rating consideration 2, the student changed his mind; this is permissible.

Read consideration No. 4.

> In consideration 4, the student didn't understand the meaning of the statement. When you encounter a consideration that "doesn't make sense," mark it "DO NOT UNDERSTAND."
>
> At the right side of the page, near the bottom, is a box divided into three. From the choices that the student made under the column "GREAT IMPORTANCE," he ranked number 8 as the most important consideration to him and wrote it in the space provided. He then rated number 3 as his second most important consideration. For his third choice he had to decide which of the considerations under the column of "SOME IMPORTANCE" meant the most to him. He selected number 9.
>
> You are asked to rate each consideration after the four stories in the booklet in the same manner and then rank the three most important considerations. Check to make sure you made no errors in copying such numbers. Please print.
>
> Please remember you are asked to identify the three considerations most important to you. Your opinions are important to this survey and will be treated as confidential.
>
> Do you have any questions?

Answer questions.

> You have 20 minutes approximately to complete this survey. Now open your booklet and start reading Story 1. If you have a question while writing, raise your hand and I'll come to you. When you finish a story, go on to the next one. When all four stories are completed, if any time if left, check over your responses.

At the end of the period, collect all booklets and pencils, if given. Thank the students for their cooperction. Write on your copy of the survey any problem that may have arisen.

USE OF THE ICS

Elsewhere in this manual the reader will have found general and specific suggestions for the use of the ICS by the teacher, principal, or researcher. It remains to say a word about the use or abuse of data which could be obtained from an administration of the ICS. When those words have been said, then it will be clear why the use of ICS must be authorized and supervised by the ICS's developers.

This edition of the ICS is properly called a "trial edition" in acknowledgement of its imperfect nature at this point in time. The need for broader field trials is mentioned elsewhere. Metaphorically, the ICS is perhaps a Model T or a Model A: it runs, but it is not yet engineered for today's superhighways.

The ICS is useful, we think, to interested persons by helping them to make estimates of students' moral reasoning styles. For the moment, an estimate is just an estimate; a good estimate, we hope. The three-digit MRS may give an impression of exactness that is not intended. We think the scores are sensitive to change (development) in moral reasoning structures that occur over time and which may be accelerated by instruction in moral reasoning. Hence the "number game" may be a legitimate evaluation research activity, enquiring into program effectiveness.

But a few MRS points difference between two students' papers may mean nothing more than that on all responses but one the selections were identical. Even that one item might have been an "ambiguous" consideration which one scorer might have been able to stage-score by context, whereas a very similar utterance might have been left, by another scorer, as an "ambiguous" consideration which could not be characterized by stage.

To avoid overinterpretation of the MRS, use of the PC (percentage) column on the

tally form is recommended. A distribution of responses by stage is often all that is needed in order to determine a starting point for dialogue with an individual or group.

Using PC distributions also obviates the problem of "averaging." The MRS is a global score, averaging out responses. For students in grades 7 through 9, most MRS results will range from 200 to 299. Yet for a great many students, especially in grade 9, stage 3 considerations will have been chosen at least as often as stage 2. But because the resultant three-digit number begins with a "2," some who merely look at MRS results, incorrectly assume that stage 2 is the major stage employed. This has happened occasionally when results have been discussed with school principals. If there is no need for the global score (MRS), its calculation might be omitted.

One might hope to avoid "labelling" students. A young person is not "a stage 2," or "a stage 3." His principal mode of thinking about the moral issues and concerns presented in the ICS may have a major and one or more minor stages (indeed, no cases of thinking uniformly at one stage has been observed in our trials). We need to recognize that what we usually want to know is how a respondent (student) is thinking about a particular moral issue and concern, or a constellation of such issues or concerns. We want to know this in order to communicate with the respondent at his stage of development (especially if the issue needs to be resolved at that time) or possibly at the next highest stage (especially if the purpose of the dialogue is to encourage growth).

The stage designation is concerned with ability, but is not by any means a sure-fire predictor of behavior. Many situational variables may come between high capacity for moral thinking and the decision made and action taken.

The use of the ICS as an evaluation instrument has not been fully explored, though its creation grew from a need for a better means of assessing growth of moral reasoning.

At the moment, the ICS seems well-suited to values education programs where students are expected to look at situations where values are in conflict, where alternative actions are possible, and where the consequences of actions needed to be considered. If the teaching method puts the learner at the focus of the dilemma scenario and asks for logical, analytical thinking and responsible answers, the ICS may serve well not only as a "testing" device, but as an instructional aid, too. The caution here is that the dilemma scenarios used in instruction should not outwardly resemble the scenarios in the ICS, but that the issues and concerns will be common to teaching and testing. Obviously, if the teaching is merely a rehearsal for the "test," then the ICS may not measure anything more than memory.

The developers of the ICS are mindful that the Ontario Ministry of Education funded this research and development project because it believes that the product would be useful in schools across the province. To the end that their hopes may be realized, the project is prepared the make the ICS available for research purposes or field trials. All use must be authorized and supervised by the project staff, however.

For further information, please contact The Research Office, Division of Planning and Development, The York County Board of Education, Box 40, Aurora, Ontario, L4G 3H2, Canada.

LEVEL 2

FORM A

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

STUDENT'S NAME _____

SEX _____ AGE (Years) _____ (Months) _____

SCHOOL _____ GRADE _____

DATE _____

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE, PLEASE

	I	II	III	IV	A	B	PC
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
K							
U							
A							

$$MRS = \frac{(B)}{(A)} \times 100$$

Copyright, VE Project, The York County Board of Education, Aurora, Ontario, 1975.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

This booklet has four short stories. Each story presents a "problem" requiring a decision. Of course, many things may be considered before a decision is made.

For the first three stories some possible considerations are listed. You may add to each list. For the fourth story you are asked to list all the important considerations that occur to you. For each story you will be asked to identify the three considerations most important to you. Your opinions are important to this survey and will be treated as confidential.

Here is a sample to show how the first three stories in this survey are to be done. (There are special instructions with the fourth story.)

THE TRIP

In September Joe's French teacher announced that a week-long study tour of Quebec would take place in February. Class members could go at a cost of $150.00 each. The teacher explained the many educational and other benefits of this trip and Joe was eager to go.

Joe's parents gladly agreed to let him go if he paid for the trip with the earnings from his part-time job. By January Joe had his trip money saved. But at Christmas Joe's best friend had received an expensive stereo set which Joe liked very much.

Joe considered dropping out of the Quebec trip and using his savings to buy a really good stereo.

Step #1

On the opposite page are some considerations which might be important in deciding whether to go on the trip or to buy a stereo.

A check mark has been put in the space on the right side of the page to indicate how important some student thought each consideration was.

In rating considerations 2 and 5, the student has changed his mind: this is permissible.

The student did not understand consideration 4, so he marked its importance as "NONE." Any consideration which "doesn't make sense" should be rated this way.

Spaces are provided so that important considerations may be added. In this sample, two considerations have been written in.

Step #2

From the choices the student made, he selected number 3 as the MOST IMPORTANT consideration and put its number in the space provided below. Then he did the same for the SECOND MOST IMPORTANT and THIRD MOST IMPORTANT considerations.

THE TRIP

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether Joe could afford stereo records	✓		
2. Whether Joe's parents would be disappointed if he changes his mind	~~✓~~	✓	
3. Whether important educational and other benefits will be lost			✓
4. Whether cultural transmission will be reversed	✓		
5. Whether Joe can possibly save enough to take the trip and buy the stereo too		✓	~~✓~~
6. Whether the Quebec trip can be taken next year		✓	
7. Whether his friend would let him borrow his stereo	✓		
8. Whether the trip might be called off if Joe and a few other students dropped out.			✓
9. Whether his teacher would be unhappy or angry if Joe cancelled out of the trip		✓	

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	3
Second most important consideration	8
Third most important consideration	5

Story 1

TEAMMATES

Sue and Jean are classmates and both are also stars on their school's volleyball team. The championship game is to be played on Friday afternoon.

On Monday their teacher reminded them that the end-of-term mathematics test would be held on Wednesday and results given on Thursday.

Later Sue said to Jean, "Remember, I was away all last week? I'm so far behind I'll probably fail the test and then they'll put me off the team. You're really good in math and you sit beside me in class. If you keep your paper close to the edge of the desk, I can see enough answers to pass. I'll probably only need to copy two or three answers."

Jean wondered what to do.

TEAMMATES

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether Sue and Jean are close friends			
2. Whether Jean might be caught and given a failing mark for letting Sue copy			
3. Whether it was fair of the teacher to make Sue take the test so soon after a long absence			
4. Whether any real good could come to the school if copying on exams was practised			
5. Whether it would go against the rights of other students to let Sue copy			
6. Whether Jean could be dropped from the team if she was caught letting Sue copy			
7. Whether Sue had ever helped Jean in a similar situation			
8. Whether Sue could get extra help and learn enough math to pass			
9. Whether _____ _____			
10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story II

THE OVERDOSE

An elderly man was slowly dying of a very painful disease for which there seemed to be no cure. The man's son was a doctor and he gave his father as large a dose of pain-killer as was safe. At last even a dose that great could not ease the terrible agony. The man begged for a deadly overdose of the pain-killing drug to put him out of his suffering.

The doctor considered giving his father the overdose.

THE OVERDOSE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether the family is in favour of giving the overdose			
2. Whether the doctor is bound by the same law as everyone else and must not kill people			
3. Whether God and the law would be in conflict if society kept alive by force those who want to die			
4. Whether all elderly and ill persons would be endangered if society permitted such actions			
5. Whether the overdose could be made to look like an accident or suicide			
6. Whether the doctor might be punished for causing his father's death			
7. Whether the right to die overrides the medical obligation to society's behavior			
8. Whether one can ever justify ending any human life			
9. Whether _____ _____			
10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story III

THE CLASS SALE

A class asked the school principal for permission to hold a sale of articles they all made in their Industrial Arts and Home Economics courses. He said, "OK, but first work out all arrangements with your home room teacher." The students agreed that any profit would be divided equally among all class members. Their teacher approved of this agreement.

The sale made a lot of money and the next day a problem arose. Several students thought that the profits should be shared differently than first agreed upon. All the students met in private to decide what to do.

Some thought that a bigger share of the profits should go to students whose articles brought the highest prices or to those who worked hardest and longest to make and sell the items. Someone suggested that all the money should be spent on a class party or a trip. Give all the money to charity, said a student, or to the poorer students in the class, said another. Some said the original agreement should be kept.

You wonder what might happen if the original agreement were changed by your class.

THE CLASS SALE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether you would get less money if the original agreement was changed			
2. Whether anyone's feelings would be hurt if the original agreement was changed			
3. Whether the teacher would be furious if the original agreement was changed			
4. Whether anyone's rights would be acted against by changing from the original agreement			
5. Whether you should vote for what you really believe, no matter what			
6. Whether the principal might punish the class for changing the original agreement			
7. Whether a good friend might be angry if you voted to change the agreement			
8. Whether a valued school tradition might be broken if a class went back on an agreement			
9. Whether _____ _____			
10. Whether _____ _____			

From the decisions you have just made, select the

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

Story IV

ROCK CONCERT

Diane, aged 13, wanted to attend the rock concert which was coming to town.

Her mother gave Diane permission to go if she could pay for it herself. Diane saved enough from doing chores and babysitting, plus $5 more.

But her mother changed her mind and said that any money Diane saved would have to go toward the new clothes she wanted.

Diane decided to go to the concert anyway. She turned over only $5 for clothes and then asked her mother if she could spend that night with a friend. Her mother agreed but Diane went to the rock concert instead.

The next day Diane told Samantha, her 16-year-old sister, all that had happened.

Samantha was very concerned. She wondered whether she should talk with her mother.

ROCK CONCERT

What do YOU think is important for Samantha to consider?

Please write your thoughts in the spaces provided. Write in only important or very important considerations.

After you have written in these considerations, please select the three most important and identify these in the space provided at the foot of the page.

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE SOME	IMPORTANCE GREAT
1. Whether _____		
2. Whether _____		
3. Whether _____		
4. Whether _____		
5. Whether _____		

Most important consideration	
Second most important consideration	
Third most important consideration	

LEVEL 2

FORM 78FC

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

STUDENT'S NAME _____

SEX _____ AGE (Years) _____ (Months) _____

SCHOOL _____ GRADE _____

DATE _____

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE, PLEASE

	I	II	III	IV	A	B	PC
1							
2							
3							
4							
K					(A)	(B)	

$$MRS = \frac{(B)}{(A)} \times 100$$

93

Copyright, VE Project, The York County Board of Education, Aurora, Ontario, 1975.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS SURVEY

This booklet has four short stories. Each story presents a "problem" requiring a decision. Of course, many things may be considered before a decision is made.

For each story some possible considerations are listed. For each story you will be asked to identify the three considerations most important to YOU. Your opinions are important to this survey and will be treated as confidential.

Here is a sample to show how the stories in this survey are to be done.

THE TRIP

In September Joe's French teacher announced that a week-long study tour of Quebec would take place in February. Class members could go at a cost of $150.00 each. The teacher explained the many educational and other benefits of this trip and Joe was eager to go.

Joe's parents gladly agreed to let him go if he paid for the trip with the earnings from his part-time job. By January Joe had his trip money saved. But at Christmas Joe's best friend had received an expensive stereo set which Joe wanted very much.

Joe considered dropping out of the Quebec trip and using his savings to buy a really good stereo.

Step #1

On the opposite page are some considerations which might be important in deciding whether to go on the trip or to buy a stereo.

A check mark has been put in the space on the right side of the page to indicate how important some student thought each consideration was.

The student thought consideration 1 unimportant so he rated its importance as "NONE".

In rating considerations 2 and 5, the student has changed his mind: this is permissible.

The student did not understand consideration 4, so he marked it as "Do Not Understand". Any consideration which "doesn't make sense" should be rated this way.

Step #2

From the ratings that the student made, he ranked consideration number 8 as MOST IMPORTANT and wrote its number in the space provided. Then he rated number 3 as SECOND MOST IMPORTANT. Finally he rated number 9 as THIRD MOST IMPORTANT.

THE TRIP

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS		IMPORTANCE			
		Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1.	Whether Joe could afford stereo records.		✓		
2.	Whether Joe's parents would be disappointed if he changes his mind.		≠	✓	
3.	Whether important educational and other benefits will be lost.				✓
4.	Whether cultural transmission will be reversed.	✓			
5.	Whether Joe can possibly save enough to take the trip and buy the stereo too.			✓	≠
6.	Whether the Quebec trip can be taken next year.			✓	
7.	Whether his friend would let him borrow his stereo.		✓		
8.	Whether the trip might be called off if Joe and a few other students dropped out.				✓
9.	Whether his teacher would be unhappy or angry if Joe cancelled out of the trip.			✓	

From the decisions you have just made, select the

MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION	8
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION	3
THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION	9

Story 1

TEAMMATES

Sue and Christine are classmates and both are also stars on their school's volleyball team. The championship game is to be played on Friday afternoon.

On Monday their teacher reminded them that the end-of-term mathematics test would be held on Wednesday and results given on Thursday.

Later Sue said to Christine, "Remember, I was away all last week? I'm so far behind I'll probably fail the test and then they'll put me off the team. You're really good in math and you sit beside me in class. If you keep your paper close to the edge of the desk, I can see enough answers to pass. I'll probably only need to copy two or three answers."

Christine wondered what to do.

TEAMMATES

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE			
	Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether it is fair to Sue's constitutional relationships.				
2. Whether Christine might be caught and given a failing mark for letting Sue copy.				
3. Whether any real good would come to the school if copying on exams was practised.				
4. Whether Christine might be caught and her mother would find out.				
5. Whether it was fair of the teacher to make Sue take the test so soon after a long absence.				
6. Whether the volleyball team really meant a lot to Sue.				
7. Whether it is fair to other students who were also away.				
8. Whether it would do Sue any good to copy.				
9. Whether society has the right to take advantage of Christine's previous ineptitude.				
10. Whether Christine would be dropped from the team if she was caught letting Sue copy.				
11. Whether Sue could get extra help and learn enough math to pass.				
12. Whether Christine and Sue were really close friends.				

From the decisions you have just made, select the

MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

Story II

THE OVERDOSE

An elderly man was slowly dying of a very painful disease for which there seemed to be no cure. The man's son was a doctor and he gave his father as large a dose of pain-killer as was safe. At last even a dose that great could not ease the terrible agony. The man begged for a deadly overdose of the drug to put him out of his suffering forever.

The doctor considered giving his father the overdose.

THE OVERDOSE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE			
	Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether the doctor might lose his job because the authorities will find out sooner or later.				
2. Whether the right to die overrides the medical obligation to society's behavior.				
3. Whether the doctor might be sent to jail for breaking the law.				
4. Whether the drug could be left within the reach of the dying father so he could take the overdose by himself.				
5. Whether the family is in favour of giving the overdose.				
6. Whether the son should risk his own life because of his father's wishes.				
7. Whether the hospital should make the decision.				
8. Whether the doctor is bound by the same law against killing as everyone else.				
9. Whether all elderly and ill persons would be endangered if society permitted such actions.				
10. Whether it is best for the father to have the overdose because he is going to die anyway.				
11. Whether honesty and the law would be in conflict if the doctor made a decision from a normative base.				
12. Whether the doctor might be punished for causing his father's death.				

From the decisions you have just made, select the

MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION ☐

SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION ☐

THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION ☐

Story III

THE CLASS SALE

A class asked the school principal for permission to hold a sale of articles they all made in their Industrial Arts and Home Economics courses. He said, "OK, but first work out all arrangements with your home room teacher." The students agreed that any profit would be divided equally among all class members. Their teacher approved of this agreement.

The sale made a lot of money and the next day a problem arose. Several students thought that the profits should be shared differently than first agreed upon. All the students met in private to decide what to do, and many suggestions for a new agreement were made.

You wonder what might happen if the original agreement were changed by your class.

CLASS SALE

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE			
	Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether your interests would be hurt by a new agreement.				
2. Whether you should vote for what you really believe, no matter what.				
3. Whether anyone's feelings would be hurt if the original agreement was changed.				
4. Whether the teacher would punish the class when he finally found out the agreement was changed.				
5. Whether you would get less money if the original agreement was changed.				
6. Whether someone who worked really hard would be cheated out of their share.				
7. Whether a penny saved is a penny earned.				
8. Whether a good friend might be angry if you voted to change the agreement.				
9. Whether the class wouldn't be allowed to hold another sale.				
10. Whether any new agreement would morally persuade the original agreement.				
11. Whether one would be able to keep an agreement later on in life, if he compromises now.				
12. Whether the principal would blame the teacher when the agreement was changed.				

From the decisions you have just made, select the

MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

Story IV

ROCK CONCERT

Diane, aged 13, wanted to attend the rock concert which was coming to town.

Her mother gave Diane permission to go if she could pay for it herself. Diane saved enough from doing chores and babysitting, plus $5 more.

But her mother changed her mind and said that any money Diane saved would have to go toward the new clothes she wanted.

Diane decided to go to the concert anyway. She turned over only $5 for clothes and then asked her mother if she could spend that night with a friend. Her mother agreed but Diane went to the rock concert instead.

The next day Diane told Samantha, her 16-year-old sister, all that had happened.

Samantha was very concerned. She wondered whether she should talk with her mother.

ROCK CONCERT

How much importance do YOU think should be given to the following considerations?

CONSIDERATIONS	IMPORTANCE			
	Do Not Understand	NONE	SOME	GREAT
1. Whether Diane would be punished by her parents.				
2. Whether the mother was concerned about Diane's best interests.				
3. Whether the lies Diane told her mother would be good for her in the future.				
4. Whether the mother would make Diane pay the money back.				
5. Whether Samantha should not tell her mother because if she told her, indeed, she would be.				
6. Whether Diane has to make up her own mind because it is her money.				
7. Whether Diane had a platonic underlying relationship with her friend.				
8. Whether Diane's mother was justified in going back on an agreement.				
9. Whether arrangements made between two family members should be placed ahead of the well-being of the whole family.				
10. Whether Samantha would be punished for not telling her mother right away.				
11. Whether Samantha should break the confidence between her and her sister.				
12. Whether Diane would do it again if Samantha didn't tell their mother.				

From the decisions you have just made, select the

MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

SECOND MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

THIRD MOST IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION

SECTION II

Dilemma Discussions Project

DILEMMA DISCUSSIONS PROJECT

E.J. Sand P.S., Thornhill
J.L.R. Bell P.S., Newmarket

April - June 1976

Participants:

Gord Penrose	-	Master Teacher, Science
Erle Kahnert	-	Master Teacher, English
Tom Cober	-	Principal, E.J. Sand P.S.
Bill Gordon	-	Vice-Principal, E.J. Sand P.S.
Ishwar Prabdial	-	Teacher, E.J. Sand P.S.
Norm Barnard	-	Principal, J.L.R. Bell P.S.
Carole Cameron	-	Teacher, J.L.R. Bell P.S.
Wallace Halladay	-	Research Office

JUNE 1976

INTRODUCTION

Ontario's educators have been encouraged to include a Values (Moral) Education component in their curriculum. Both The Formative Years (1975) and Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions (1975) contain a number of goal statements which pertain to Values Education.

Appendix A contains a summary of some of these goals taken from the two documents. The purpose of the program described in this report was to choose and implement one related goal statement. The specific goal statement chosen was taken from The Formative Years (1975) (p. 20) "the child in the Primary and Junior Divisions will be given opportunities to: begin to develop a personal set of values by identifying value alternatives and their consequences, selecting personal values from the alternatives, internalizing the values selected and acting in accordance with the values selected."

Background

Gordon Penrose initiated a program in Values Education at Bayview Fairways P.S., York County, in the 1974-1975 school year. (See Appendix B.) His students constructed and discussed several moral dilemmas. During the discussions students were given the opportunity to identify and select value alternatives, and secondly, to discuss the various consequences of the alternatives. Furthermore, some attempt was being made to monitor the discussions in a Kohlbergian framework (Kohlberg, 1969). In his role as a master teacher, Mr. Penrose, with Mr. Kahnert, approached two schools, E.J. Sand and J.L.R. Bell Public Schools, offering to assist interested teachers in the implementation of a Values Education Program.

On March 8, 1976, Messrs. Penrose, Kahnert, Cober, Gordon, and Halladay met at E.J. Sand P.S., Thornhill. Mr. Penrose outlined the goals of the program, and some examples of the moral dilemmas which had been generated and discussed at Bayview Fairways P.S. The participants agreed to proceed with a series of five lessons on alternate Monday afternoons in April, May, and June. The classes involved were Mr. Prabdial's grade 6 class and Mr. Gordon's grade 5 class.

On March 8, 1976 Messrs. Penrose, Kahnert, Barnard and Halladay met at J.L.R. Bell P.S., Newmarket. Again, Mr. Penrose explained the program he was offering to implement. Mr. Barnard requested that a further meeting be scheduled at which time a presentation could be made to the staff of the school.

On March 30, Messrs. Penrose, Kahnert and Halladay made a brief presentation to the staff of the school. Following the meeting Mrs. Carole Cameron, grade 4 teacher, agreed to participate in the project.

PROCEDURES

Classes were held on the following dates and times:

E.J. Sand P.S.

Grade 5 class (Bill Gordon, teacher)

Monday, April 5, 1976	1:30 - 2:20
Monday, April 26, 1976	1:30 - 2:20
Monday, May 10, 1976	1:30 - 2:20
Monday, May 31, 1976	1:30 - 2:20
Monday, June 14, 1976	1:30 - 2:20

Grade 6 class (Ish Prabdial, teacher)

Monday, April 5, 1976	2:30 - 3:20
Monday, May 10, 1976	2:30 - 3:20
Monday, May 31, 1976	2:30 - 3:20
Monday, June 14, 1976	2:30 - 3:20

J.L.R. Bell P.S.

Grade 4 class (Carole Cameron, teacher)

Monday, May 3, 1976	1:20 - 2:10
Monday, May 17, 1976	1:20 - 2:10
Monday, June 7, 1976	1:20 - 2:10
Monday, June 21, 1976	1:20 - 2:10

On many occasions the same lesson, with minor variations was given to all three classes. In this section, a sample of lesson outlines is provided to give an indication of the occurances during the 13 lessons.

Lesson 1 - E.J. Sand P.S.
Grade 5 class; Bill Gordon, teacher
April 5, 1976 1:30 - 2:20

Mr. Gordon introduced the guests (Messrs. Penrose, Kahnert, and Halladay) in the classroom. Mr. Kahnert led the class in a "centering" exercise. Every lesson in this project began with a centering exercise taken from

"The Centering Book, Awareness Activities for Children, Parents, and Teachers" (1975).

Mr. Penrose gave the lesson entitled IALAC or I am Loveable and Capable (1973). This lesson, also given to both other classes, was enjoyed by the students. At the end of the lesson, Mr. Penrose asked the students to write their own IALAC story. Several students in Mr. Gordon's class wrote IALAC stories and they were read at the outset of each lesson during the remainder of the project.

Lesson 2 - E.J. Sand P.S.
Grade 5 class; Bill Gordon, teacher
April 26, 1976

At the outset of this lesson, Mr. Penrose received several IALAC stories written by the students in Mr. Gordon's class. Mr. Penrose chose one story, and it was read to the class by a student.

Mr. Kahnert led the class in a brief centering exercise.

Mr. Halladay introduced the concept of a "consideration" in a dilemma situation. He gave the example of a boy trying to decide whether to buy a new bicycle or go on a class trip. The class discussed several "considerations" the boy might think about, before making his decision.

Mr. Penrose told the dilemma story of two students, Martin and Edna, who saw another student, Eddy, inside the school. Eddy was being threatened by a gang of boys waiting outside the school building.

The class broke into four groups to prepare various considerations Martin and Edna might think about before doing something in this situation.

The class generated a total of 26 considerations. Mr. Penrose reviewed these considerations with the class, and asked the students to choose the best and worst considerations of those given. Mr. Gordon collected and tallied the results.

TABLE 1

CONSIDERATIONS GENERATED BY BILL GORDON'S CLASS

April 26, 1976

BULLYING DILEMMA

1.	Whether if Eddy tells the principal he should get beaten up.	(b-2 w-1)[a]
2.	Whether Martin should tell somebody and if he did what might happen.	
3.	Whether he could sick his dog on the gang.	(b-1)
4.	Whether Martin could form a gang.	
5.	Whether Eddy should call for help.	(b-1 w-3)
6.	4 against 2	(w-3)
7.	They're tougher.	(b-1)
8.	Eddy's new at the school.	(w-1)
9.	Martin and Edna were afraid.	
10.	Can we get help.	(b-1 w-1)
11.	Should we get help.	(b-1)
12.	Who could we get to help.	(b-2)
13.	How would we feel if we didn't help.	
14.	Whether Martin and Edna could gang up on one of them.	(w-5)
15.	Whether they should go and get one of the teacher.	
16.	Whether they should try and get even.	(b-1)
17.	Whether the gang would get tired and go away, if Eddy just waited.	

18. Whether the gang and everyone else would call them tattletales, etc. if they tell someone. (w-2)

19. Whether the gang has a good reason for getting Eddy. (b-3)

20. Whether the gang can get Eddy later anyway. (w-1)

21. Whether or not to sneak Eddy out in the middle of a group. (b-14)

22. Whether or not to attract the gang's attention. (b-1 w-2)

23. Whether or not to talk to Ungerman's girlfriend and get her to talk to Ungerman. (b-1 w-1)

24. Whether or not to get someone from Eddy's family. (b-1)

25. Whether or not to tell Eddy to be brave. (b-1 w-8)

26. Whether or not to talk to Ungerman. (w-5)

---

[a] coding indicates the number of children who chose the item as best or worst choice. In this case, two children thought this was the best consideration, one thought it was the worst.

Lesson 2 - J.L.R. Bell P.S.
Grade 4 class; Carole Cameron, teacher
May 17, 1976

Mr. Kahnert led the class in a centering exercise.

Mr. Penrose proceeded to present the dilemma of Lisa:

> "Lisa was a girl in grade one. Some students in grade 4 had been teasing her, beating her up, and generally bothering her. Lisa was very upset and wondered what to do."

Mr. Penrose asked the class what Lisa could do in this situation. Some suggestions were:

Tell their (grade 4's) parents	Kick at them
Tell the principal	Tell her parents
Take their hats	Tease them
Get their older brother or sister to get them	Avoid them

The students were then asked to consider some of the solutions in light of the consequences to the Grade 4 students and to Lisa.

The class broke into four groups and discussed the solutions. The majority of the considerations discussed were of the nature of retributive justice, i.e., punishment to the grade four's and the consequent retribution to Lisa.

The students presented their findings to the rest of the class under Mr. Penrose's leadership. (See Table 2.)

Mr. Penrose finished the lesson by continuing the dilemma:

> "Lisa was walking her younger brother when she saw a pretty dress in a shop window. She let her younger brother go and went to the window to look. When this happened, her brother fell and chipped a tooth."

He then asked the students to decide which was worse: what Lisa did to her brother or what the boys did to Lisa? The responses written by the students are given in Table 3.

TABLE 2

SOLUTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

GROUP 1

Solution	Effects on Grade 4 Students	Worst Possible Effect(s) on Lisa
1. Phone the parents.	Parents will speak to the student. Strap them and then send to their room. Grounded.	Grade 4's would kid her. Beat her up one more time.
2. Avoid them.	Leave her alone or beat her up. Take everything away from her.	She might get beat up or might leave her alone. Might make friends.
3. Tell the principal.	Suspended. Strap. Stay after school. Write lines.	Give her a reward. Congratulate. Grade 4's would get back at her.
4. Tell her own parents.	Punish them. Give them a strap.	Beat her up.

TABLE 2

SOLUTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

GROUP 2

Solution	Effects on Grade 4 Students	Worst Possible Effect(s) on Lisa
1. Tell their parents.	Take away privileges. Stay away from Lisa. Stay in room for a day.	Could beat her up again. Make it worse for her.
2. Tell the principal.	Give them the strap. Make them do math all day. Make them miss art.	Make up things that she never did. Beat her up worse.
3. Take their hats.	Go and sneak their hats. Their mother may send them to bed early or without any supper.	They could take her hat and coat. Beat her up worse.
4. Get their older brother or sister to get them.	Tell them to leave her alone. Hit them. Water to spit at them.	Gang up on Lisa.
5. Kick at them.	Legs might bleed.	Kick back at her. Hit her in nose.

TABLE 2

SOLUTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

GROUP 3

	Solution	Effects on Grade 4 Students	Worst Possible Effect(s) on Lisa
1.	Phone pupils' mothers.	Two parents will talk - grade 4 pupils will get in trouble.	Lisa would get blamed by her own parents if other parents win the argument.
2.	Tell the principal.	Principal will warn them first and strap them next. Keep grade 4's in until Lisa leaves.	They would beat her up off the school grounds.
3.	Tell the principal.	Give them homework so they don't have time.	Beat her up.
4.	Get older brother or sister to get them.	Grade 4 students would get beaten up.	Grade 4 children get their older older brothers and sisters to fight Lisa's sisters and brothers.
5.	Avoid them.	Grade 4 students would not have anyone to pick on.	Follow her and beat her up.
6.	Tease them.	Ignore her or get angry.	Beat her up more than ever.
7.	Tell her parents.	Tell children not to leave too early.	On the weekends they would beat her up.

TABLE 2

SOLUTIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

GROUP 4

	Solution	Effects on Grade 4 Students	Worst Possible Effect(s) on Lisa
1.	Phone pupils' mothers.	The two parents will talk and the grade 4's will get it.	Lisa would get blamed by her parents.
2.	Tell the principal.	The principal will warn them first and strap them next.	They would beat her up off the school grounds.
3.	Tell the principal.	Keep the grade 4's after school until Lisa gets home.	Beat her up.
4.	Get older brother or sister to get them.	The 4's people would get beaten up.	The 4's will get their brothers and sisters to fight Lisa's.
5.	Avoid them.	Grade 4 people would not have anyone to pick on.	Follow her and beat her up.
6.	Tease them.	Ignore her and get angry.	Beat her up more than ever.
7.	Tell her parents.	Tell the child not to leave early.	On the weekends they would beat her up.

TABLE 3

GRADE 4 RESPONSES

Brother's lip because the girls never cut Lisa.

Brother's lip. The mother and father have to pay for the chipped tooth and he got hurt.

I think that her brother's lip was worse because it is her younger brother and she was responsible.

Lisa's brother because a chipped tooth doesn't grow back.

She would get hurt and only for one second her brother would feel pain.

Brother's lip because it was her responsibility to look after her brother.

Brother's lip because she should be responsible for her brother.

Brother's lip because her brother was bleeding.

Brother's lip because she saw a beautiful pair of shoes and ran off without her brother.

Brother's lip because she was responsible.

Her brother's lip because she was in charge of her brother.

Brother's lip because she was responsible for her brother.

Brother's lip because she chipped his tooth and she was responsible.

I think her brother's lip because she was responsible for him.

What happened to her brother because she was responsible for her little brother.

What she did to her brother because she was responsible.

I think what Lisa did to her brother was worse because she was responsible for him and he was younger than her.

I think that it was worse for her to leave her brother because he got hurt and she was responsible.

Brother's lip because she was responsible for her brother.

Lisa was hurting her brother. Was worse because she was responsible for her little brother.

I think what Lisa did to her brother was worse than what the grade 4 pupils did to Lisa because Lisa wasn't bleeding or chipped her tooth.

What she did to her brother was worse because her brother's damage was permanent until his tooth falls out.

Brother's lip because what the grade 4's did to Lisa didn't hurt her, just made her unhappy.

Brother's lip because Lisa was responsible because Lisa would get in trouble from her parents.

Brother's lip because she would get into a lot of trouble and her brother might have to get caps on his front teeth.

Brother's lip because the girl is responsible for the boy.

Lesson 3 - E.J. Sand P.S.
Grade 6 class; Ishwar Prabdial, teacher
Monday, May 31, 1976

Mr. Halladay asked the students to give examples of the behaviors of others which they found unlikeable. Eight examples given were:

1) brags a lot
2) bothering you
3) call you names
4) criticize
5) say one thing, do another
6) liars
7) people who ignore you
8) people who never learn

Fictitious student names were assigned to each behavioral characteristic. The class was assigned the task of choosing two of these fictitious students to be representatives on an orienteering contest.

Five groups were established, and they were asked to choose a secretary and chairman. The groups reported the following occurances:

1) How the secretary and chairman were chosen
2) How the fictitious representatives were chosen
3) The reasons for the two choices.

At the end of the lesson the groups presented their findings. Several groups (but not all) were able to realize that criteria was important to establish before making choices.

Lesson 4 - E.J. Sand P.S.
Grade 5 class; Bill Gordon, teacher
May 31, 1976

Mr. Halladay read an IALAC story to the class.

Mr. Penrose presented the concept of "Avoiding Negative Energy." He pointed out that sometimes people are hit by other person's, often unintended, negative energy and feelings, and there are many ways of avoiding these feelings, e.g., pretend it's an arrow and let it go by, let the wind blow by you.

Mr. Penrose told the story of Mynard, a young school boy:

> "Mynard was often picked on by Mrs. Althea because he was daydreaming, his notes were messy, or he did not know what to do. Mynard was a 'loner.' At home Mynard was an expert on small motors. One day, he brought to school some samples of small motors which he had made. As soon as he presented them to the class, Aloe, another boy said that Mynard had cheated and someone else had made the motors. Vascoe claimed Mynard's father had made the motors for him."

Mr. Penrose asked the class to give some examples of feelings associated with the story. Examples were:

anger	disgusted
happy	surprised
sadness	loneliness
insulted	puzzled
annoyed	bothered
hate	loved
amazed	bewildered
proud	exhausted
pestered	unloved
embarrassed	

Mr. Penrose asked the class to choose which feelings applied to each of the participants; Mynard, Mrs. Althea, and Vascoe and Aloe, before and after the presentation of the small motors.

Members of the class illustrated, in pantomime, some of the feelings

of each of the people during the story.

Finally, Mr. Penrose asked who was most to blame in this situation and what feeling would be associated with that person.

This lesson enabled the children to see three points of view in a conflict situation, and in particular, to associate emotions with each point of view.

Lesson 5 - E.J. Sand P.S.
Grade 5 class; Bill Gordon, teacher
Monday, June 14, 1976

Mr. Halladay read an IALAC story to the class.

Mr. Kahnert led the group in a centering exercise.

Mr. Penrose read the dilemma of two children who were very good friends. One child found her friend going through the coat pockets of the other children.

Mr. Penrose and Mr. Kahnert showed the class how they might "role-play" this situation. Different pairs of students went to the front of the class and acted out variations of how the dilemma would turn out. Students were asked to make observations about the feelings and reactions of the two characters in each drama. All children were given an opportunity to act out each of the roles with a partner, and then to reverse the roles.

Another dilemma of a boy and a rabbit was presented. The boy who had been given the responsibility of looking after the rabbit forgot to complete his duties one evening. The students took the roles of the rabbit and the boy.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Most of the children in the three classes seemed to enjoy the brief experience of the four or five lessons.

The children particularly enjoyed activities in which the whole class was involved in a role-playing exercise. At one point, in Bill Gordon's grade 5 class, (June 14, 1976), Mr. Penrose began to introduce a second dilemma situation to the class. Before allowing Mr. Penrose to proceed with a second dilemma, the children insisted that they be allowed to reverse their roles from the first dilemma situation.

On several occasions throughout the project, new insights into dilemma situations were gathered when the children were allowed to role-play. Furthermore, the role-playing technique allowed all children to become involved in hypothetical conflict situations. The straightforward discussion of dilemmas was too abstract and uninteresting for some children.

In light of the original instructional objectives from The Formative Years, the program was successful to the extent that the children were given opportunities to identify value alternatives and their consequences. Whether the children internalized the values they selected, and acted in accordance, is a conclusion requiring data which was not collected during the project.

A second objective of the project was to attempt an assessment of student dialogue using Kohlberg's theory of moral development. In the grade 4 and 5 classes, much of the discussion involved Preconventional reasoning. Table 2, which is a summary of the grade 4 students' discussions, provides many examples of Stage 1 reasoning. In the grade 6 class, some students were beginning to offer

arguments at the Conventional Level (example; at one point during a discussion, a student pointed out that it was important to consider the school's reputation if a certain action was followed).

Nevertheless, teachers with some exposure to Kohlbergian theory will likely find it difficult to integrate and assess the dialogue of 25 or 30 students in a classroom situation. Experience with the "Important Considerations Survey" has demonstrated that many written statements, evaluated by a "panel of experts" are not easily classified into the Kohlbergian sequence. In this type of project, a conclusion that there was an upward shift in reasoning styles by some students would require valid and reliable measurement techniques.

Recommendations

In the future, with Junior classes, it is recommended that role-playing techniques such as those described herein, or by Shaftel and Shaftel (1967) be considered for implementation.

Secondly, there is a great need for high quality measurement instruments to monitor these programs. Attempts to assess Kohlbergian growth by teacher observation, while containing some face validity, may lead to unreliable and perhaps self-fulfilling results. Objective measurement techniques with established reliability and validity are needed to provide conclusive answers to such questions as "Do dilemma discussions influence moral growth?"

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Hendricks, Gay and Russel Wills. The Centering Book, Awareness Activities for Children, Parents, and Teachers. Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence; The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. New York: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Ministry of Education, the Province of Ontario. Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions. Toronto: The Ministry, 1975.

_____. The Formative Years. Toronto: The Ministry, 1975.

Shaftel, F. and Shaftel, G. Role-Playing for Social Values: Decision-Making in the Social Studies. Englewood Cliff, N.S.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Simon, Sidney. I am Loveable and Capable; A Modern Allegory on the Classical Put-Down. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

OBJECTIVES FOR VALUES EDUCATION

From The Formative Years (p. 20)

"The child in the Primary and Junior Divisons will be given opportunities to:

- Begin to develop a personal value system within a context that reflects the priorities of a concerned society and at the same time recognizes the integrity of the individual

- become aware of the values that Canadians regard as essential to the well-being and continuing development of their society — namely, respect for the individual, concern for others, social responsibility, compassion, honesty, and the acceptance of work, thought, and leisure as valid pursuits for human beings;

- begin to develop a personal set of values by identifying value alternatives and their consequences, selecting personal values from the alternatives, internalizing the values selected, and acting in accordance with the values selected;

- identify and analyse public value issues."

From Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions (p. 20)

"The teacher's task is to help each child consciously develop a clear set of values through a process that might be described in this way:

- becoming aware of the existence of values;
- identifying value alternatives and their consequences;
- selecting personal values from the alternatives;
- internalizing the values selected;
- acting in accordance with the values selected."

APPENDIX B

VALUES EDUCATION - A PROPOSED EXPERIENCE

Developed By: Gord Penrose

Values Education - A Proposed Experience

developed by Gord Penrose

Background: With staff and students at Bayview Fairways Public School dilemmas were generated during the 1974-1975 school year. Attempts to work through some of these dilemmas were made by Years Three through Six teachers with the help of the following Master Teachers: Pat King, Howard Reynolds, Erle Kahnert. Brian Burnham assisted in both the planning and informal assessment of the programme.

For the school year 1975-1976 at Bayview Fairways it is proposed that one or more goal statements as outlined in The Formative Years on page 20 under the heading of "Values" be the basis for the programme. Several five week experiences will make up the studies programme in values for the school year.

Preliminary:

(1) Select one goal statement from The Formative Years: "begin to develop a personal set of values by identifying value alternatives and their consequences, selecting personal values from the alternatives, internalizing the values selected, and acting in accordance with the values selected".

Step #1 Select a real dilemma based upon one of the twelve themes as found in the student's dilemma book:

(i) noisy class
(ii) mistakes made in marking papers
(iii) behavior problems when teacher leaves the room
(iv) the bully
(v) broken promises
(vi) witnessing an accident
(vii) vandalism
(viii) teacher's pet
(ix) tattling on others
(x) witnessing cheating
(xi) disobedience
(xii) unfair decisions

Example of a Grade 4 Dilemma

Lamot is supposed to have his book report in. The book is thick. He has only read the first few pages. The book report is overdue as of to-day.

Considerations

1. He didn't want to do it. (no reason)
2. He wanted to do it but he didn't think sportsmen did things like that.
3. He was wrong because the teacher will punish him.
4. The teacher should make him write out lines for doing a "bad" thing like that.
5. Maybe he should do something so that the teacher won't have to say he didn't to anything.
6. Maybe the teacher will get angry at him and take her anger out on the whole class.

Step #2 Read the dilemma. Ask children to volunteer ideas of what could be done. Ask them to volunteer ideas as to what the effect(s) could be on the person who takes the action and the effects on the person who receives the consequence of this action. e.g.

	possible effect(s) on person	possible effects on his or her family
He could run away from the problem	relief	fright
	fright	guilty
	guilty	

Step #3 From the above ideas formulate with the children a list of considerations. Talk about these in term of "I agree because _____" "I disagree because _____"

Step #4 Use this chart in conjunction with "Stage characteristics" part of the leaflet. "Major characteristics of a Stage - Sequence Model of the Development of Moral Reasoning Power" supplied by the Research Office.

Preconventional

Is the orientation based on the individual outlook? group outlook? outlook based on principles?

If it is individual:

OA I want to _____(no reason) I like to _____ (no reason)
I don't want to _____ (no reason)

OB A reason but the relationship between a physical or social reason and reality is not necessary obvious.

1A It is right because it gets approval. It is wrong because it brings punishment.

1B One is paid back for doing "good" things and "bad" things. It is an immanent justice notion.

2A One sees two or more points of view and compromises.

2B Compares two or more points of view as they relate to each other.

3 One wants appreciation, admiration, and acceptance from those who count.

3A One must do his or her duty but it is not clear why.

4 One must do his or her duty and obey the law with a clear statement as to the effect on society.

Step #5 Give slips of paper. Each pupil puts his or her name on the sheet.

Read the short list of considerations. Each pupil picks one for first choice. The process is repeated for 2nd and 3rd choices. A space is left at the bottom of the sheet for additional comments and ideas.

Gordon Mulch
1st - 4 2nd - 1 3rd - 3
Comments: You should do what your mother tells you to do.

Record the individual and class results under the general heading

Preconventional or Conventional
OA-2B 3-4

During the ensuing five weeks use dilemmas from as great a range of sources as possible. Use a different source each week from the following:

(i) film strips
(ii) source books or booklets
(iii) movie clips
(iv) real life situations
(v) constructed

Step #6 Repeat #1 stage with a different dilemma.

APPENDIX C

DILEMMAS GENERATED AT BAYVIEW FAIRWAYS P.S.

INTRODUCTION

Children were asked if they would like to write stories in which a decision had to be made as to what was the appropriate action in a given situation. They were informed that there dilemma must relate to school in some way and that only the situation be described.

They were also asked not to use real names but rather to fabricate them.

GRADE ONE

Leslie Kiss — The Baseball Glove — 1 - 1

One morning Jack got out of bed. That afternoon Joe left his baseball glove at the school-grounds. When Jack and Jeff went to the school-grounds at recess the two boys saw the glove and took it home. When Joe noticed that the glove was gone he looked all around the neighborhood except Jeff's and Jack's house.

David Pavan — Bobby and the Bat — 1 - 2

Bobby found a bat and the bat belonged to Brian. Bobby gave the bat to Fuzzy.

GRADE TWO

Hari Thomson — Spacey — 2.- 1

There was a boy named Spacey! He liked going in space! He lived on Jupiter and went to space school. He had a rocket 500 stories high! It costed $700,000 to build. He had 50 gadgets in the rocket. One day his father took the rocket away.

Michelle Rival — The First Day of School — 2 - 2

Susie's brother Ernie wanted to go to school so badly. It was only his first time to go to school. When he woke up he found out there was no school. It was a holiday.

Janice Youmans — The Raw Sandwich — 2 - 3

John had a sandwich and it went raw. John's brother Mike had a sandwich and it went raw. They were both hungry.

Maureen Lynda Haan — My School — 2 - 4

When Kathy was in school it was brand new. Now it is almost three years old. Kathy is in grade two. Last year Kathy was in grade One. The year before that Kathy was in Kindergarten. In kindergarten the work was easy. Then in grade One it got a little harder. Now in grade two it is really hard. Kathy wonders about grades three, four, five, six and seven.

Caroll Carter — Mickey Mouse — 2 - 5

Mickey Mouse was in his house sleeping. He got in trouble with his mom because he had to do his homework. He went to his bedroom. He didn't do his homework.

Silvia Lanzolka — My Brother — 2 - 6

Sergio's brother Vello was playing tether-ball. He swung and he Swung and then his bone came out of his finger.

Murray Foster — The Mittens — 2 - 7

The mitten mix-up. Stuart had a nice pair of mittens. They were red with green stripes. Peter had mittens exactly the same. One day Stuart went to Peter's house. When it was time to go home he saw his mittens in Peter's house.

Paul McMinn — A Paper — 2 - 8

Andrew did not know how to do a paper. He was afraid to tell the teacher. Saul knew how to do the paper. Andrew did not know how.

Johnathan Munroe — The Shrimps — 2 - 9

Ronnie started growing shrimps with Mr. Rally. Mr. Rally gave Ronnie some egg's to hatch. Mr. Rally gave Ronnie some food for the 8 shrimps. Ronnie kept on losing the food.

Robyn Smith — The Test — 2 - 10

David got his test wrong. Mary got her test right. David felt sad. Mary felt happy.

Caroll P. E. Carter — The Noise — 2 - 11

Mrs. Moresen is a teacher. She is nice. Everybody was making noise. Then she said, "Be quiet". And they did. Then they started making a noise again.

Eddie Roberts — Big and Small — 2 - 12

Some big kids pick on Sam. He is small.

Trevor Warren — Foursquare — 2 - 13

Donny wanted to play foursquare but they would not let him. Donny was not happy.

Samara Robinowitz — The Snowball — 2 - 14

One day Peter threw a snowball and it hit a police car and he ran inside the school. The policeman came to talk to him.

Leigh Viersen — The Lost Ring — 2 - 15

One day Mary lost a ring. John found the ring. John liked Lori and gave the ring to her. Then Mary came to John's class and asked him if he saw her ring.

GRADE THREE

Nicole Rosen — Teachers Error — 3 - 1

Tim's teacher gave him 100 out of 100. Tim saw he only had 91 out of 100.

Nicole Rosen — The Bad Day — 3 - 2

Cathy and Bonnie lived on farm. One day a rain storm came. Mother and Father were on there way to town. They left their rain clothes in the car. School would start in an hour!

Alexis Dimangel — The Sticker — 3 - 3

At school John Coposi put a sticker on the teacher's chair. She sat down and the sticker was on her dress. She walked around with the sticker on her dress.

Craig Mulhollan — The Big Bat Fink — 3 - 4

One day at Baview Frownways a boy called Jimmy was called to the front of the class for science. The Science teacher was Mr. Glenrose. He said that the topic was birds so Jimmy made some wooden wings and put them on his back.

When he came back to school all the kids called him a bird fink. He did not care if he was called a fink. Then he climbed on top of the roof.

Tracey Powers — The Uniform — 3 - 5

One day Fred ripped his freind's soccer uniform. He was the biggest boy on the team. Fred thought he would beat him up. Fred said, "But he is my friend he would not hurt me". "Oh!" he is playing a game tomorrow.

Chris Pople — Broken Glasses — 3 - 6

Mary Tyler was going out to recess one day but she forgot her glasses on the counter. Her pupils had a bunch of new and old toys. The boys had guns. The guns had little stones you could put in. John thought they should play cowboys and Indians. So they were shooting and Crash! The teacher's glasses were busted by Rogie. The teacher came in from recess. How did my glasses get broken.

Sven Din — The T.V. Set — 3 - 7

One day Jon's teacher said "Sit there and stay there, while I go to the office." Jon didn't do what he was suppose to do. He started a fight and banged the school T.V. set and it broke.

Elizabeth Kiss — The Fire — 3 - 8

One evening Nancie's parents had to go somewhere for three days. After they had left Nancy invited her girlfriend over. They tried to make a cake, but when they tried to take it out of the oven Susan burned her hand. That afternoon Nancies parents called and asked them if they were all right. Then Nancy said they were all right. But they had broken three of Nancies

John Gummersall — Sam the Bad Boy — 3 - 9

There was a boy name Sam. He was a mean boy. Every day he would do one bad thing. One day he would put some bubblegum on the teacher's desk. The teacher would sit down and stick to the desk. The next day he put a stink bomb in Jodeen's desk: pow ugk!!! "Something smells! said Jodeen.

Paula Barata — The Broken glass cup — 3 - 10

Mother went away to the store. She said "Mary and Nancy go to school". So Mary and Nancy went to school. When they got to school Nancy had to hold the teacher's cup and Mary wanted the cup. They had a fight and Nancy dropped the cup.

Jackie Green — The Bullies — 3 - 11

Jackco's sister Penny is in the shelter crying because some big boys were pushing her. Penny would not let Jackco take her to the teacher.

Tony Banko — The Broken Window — 3 - 12

It is recess at school. A boy was playing ball and in a flash the ball hit the window. The window broke.

Susan Ackland — Broken window — 3 - 13

One day Mary Cook was playing outside and her mom was going to work. It was pouring down snow. Her mother said "Dress very very well and warm and you may go out to play." Her mom only worked in the morning. She left but before she left she said "Don't throw snow balls". But Mary did. She was aiming for the school roof but she hit the window.

GRADE FOUR

Tiana Perry — Research — 4 - 1

The teacher told Earbut to do research on dogs but he liked cats better. He tried it on cats but could not find a book on cats. He tried it on hamsters but he could find a book on hamsters. He tried it on birds.

Daryl Stott — The Drug — 4 - 2

Hector's best friend was a real brat. He smoked and he took drugs. One day at school his class was talking about drugs and how bad they were.

After school he told his parents what they were talking about. His father also gave him a talk about drugs. The next day was Saturday and Hector's friend asked him for a drug.

Stacey Donaghy — ZELAS Adventure — 4 - 3

Zela's mother said, "The principal called," and your teacher said that you were not well-behaved in school. Your teacher said you have not done your science, "B-But I did it!". Zela said, "You did not", said her mother. Zela did not know that her friend Oaka switched papers. Oaka rubbed out Zela's name and put on her own name instead.

Tiana Perry — S. R. A. Card — 4 - 4

Daygart was supposed to do three S.R.A. Cards before he went on to another colour. Daygart only did one and went on to another colour.

Tiana Perry — Book Report — 4 - 5

Lamot was supposed to read a book for the book report. The book he had to have read had three hundred pages. She didn't have three hundred pages read. The book report is due today.

Tiana Perry — Math Test — 4 - 6

Zcary was supposed to have done a math test. She did not have it done. When she went to correct it she put all the answers in. The teacher thought she saw Zcary do it.

Neil Foster — Jacknife — 4 - 7

Ace and his class were going on a school trip. One of his best friends brought a jacknife with him. Ace started to play with it. He cut his finger with it. The teacher had said that there were to be no knives taken on the trip.

Leonardo Lanzolla — Ice-cream — 4 - 8

Kerby had to make ice-cream for a contest with another boy. Kerby already made ice-cream. The other boy didn't even start his.

Colleen Patterson — The Birthday Gift — 4 - 9

One day Nery was at a store. She was looking for a present for her mother because it was her mother's birthday tomorrow. She only had to buy some things for her father and some things for an experiment at school. Her family had a rule Don't Borrow Money.

Colleen LeMoine — Report Card — 4 - 10

It was the first day of school and Tilly was bad. She had to stay in after school. Soon it was report card day. She got a bad one. Will she pass or not pass? When her mom opened it she was in trouble. Her sister got a good report card. So her mom and dad got her sister something for passing. They didn't buy Tilly anything because she didn't pass.

Heather Kirkwood — Stolen Math Test — 4 - 11

Tashy's class was having a math test. Tashy saw her friend Fee-Fee take the teacher's answer sheet.

GRADE FIVE

Danny Korte — Sneeky Greg — 5 - 1

One day the class was doing math. The teacher had gone down ot the office with a boy who had been bad. Greg said to his friend's "I am going to get The teacher's math book and copy the answers".

Robert Marshall — Cards — 5 - 2

One day Roel saw his friend Arnold. He was playing cards with his other friend George. Roel decided he would watch them play. Then Arnold was called over by his teacher. Then George looked at Arnolds cards and took one. Roel saw him do it.

Judy Shaw — Glenda and Larry — 5 - 3

One day Larry went to school. In the morning the class was doing math. Then in the afternoon they were doing art with scissors. Larry cut a piece of Glenda's hair off.

Dean Virgoe — Chesterd the Cheater — 5 - 4

One day at school some people were playing chess. Bange wanted to play with someone and his name was Chesterd. They had a game and Chesterd won. But the next game Bange won. Chesterd had a book under the desk. He was cheating.

Debbie Chroust — Leo's Teacher — 5 - 5

Leo's teacher made Leo mad. And at the afternoon recess Leo went in the teachers desk and stole something. Beagle saw him. Beagle was not a friend of Leo's.

Judy Chilvers — Recess Cheating — 5 - 6

One day Rhonda had gotten permission to finish her work at school during recess. Everyone was gone except Crystal and Rhonda so Rhonda assumed she had gotten permission. Then Rhonda saw Crystal reach for the answer booklet. Rhonda new Crystal was copying because she had told Crystal that morning she had not begun to write anything.

Cindy Graham — Fred Bed — 5 - 7

One day a boy named Fred Bed was looking in someone's bag. He got out some gum. It was mint gum, and See Bee said: "I saw you take that gum out of that bag".

Susan Manteufel — The Math Test — 5 - 8

One day in school Perch, a little girl, got a test about "Math". When Perch got it back she got one wrong, and 59 right. The test was out of 60. She usually got them mostly wrong.

Shirley Anne Egan — Copying — 5 - 9

Keshon was going some work. Suddenly Mercan saw him lean over and look at his friends finished and marked work.

Kevin Smith — Spelling Test — 5 - 10

Fred and Anthony were sitting together and Fred said "hey" Anthony said, "What"? Fred said, "Let's go to the teacher's desk and sneak the teacher's spelling book". Anthony said, "Ok", Then they took the spelling book and copied the questions out. Donald saw the two boys do it.

David Alexander — Spelling Test — 5 - 11

One day we had a spelling test. Donald took a spelling book. Omano saw Donald start to copy out of the book. Then he handed it to the teacher.

Kenny Priddle — Tear — 5 - 12

Joe saw Ted tear a math answer book.

Kenny Priddle — Break — 5 - 13

Sue saw Jack break a window. Jack ran.

Tina Karja — The Fight — 5 - 14

One day when Morrsel was playing with Meatless they saw a fight.

Karen Muholland — The Math Test — 5 - 15

One day the class had a math test. Toto saw April copying Jay-Jay's work.

Seema Naqui — The Test — 5 - 16

One day the class was having a test. Ray went up to the teacher's desk and took the answers. Then he went back to his seat and copy down the answers. The class saw him do it.

Paul Boynett — Beaver Changed the Name — 5 - 17

One day the class had a math test. On Wednesday the teacher announced that Kitty was the only kid to get 100%. Beaver felt upset. So at 3:30 Beaver changed the name and showed the teacher and the next day the teacher announced her mistake. Kitty cried. Beaver felt upset.

Laura Stoodley — The Punch — 5 - 18

One day Flower saw Riff punch Hender in the mouth. Hender couldn't talk because he had a fat lip. The reason he punched Hender was that Hender was sliding down the hill and Riff was looking at Hender. Hender didn't know who hit him, but Flower did.

Linda Migotto — The Ripper — 5 - 19

There was a boy name Punky. He had to do some work but instead he ripped two piece of papers up.

Linda Migotto — The April Fool Quiz — 5 - 20

The class was doing an April Fool quiz. Coco saw Paco put in the answer from Saco's paper.

Linda Migotto — The Copier — 5 - 21

Geo was looking for his papers which was all right. When he passed Nina's desk she had his papers and was putting in the answer.

Ensa Dale — Sadie is Naughty — 5 - 22

One day Sadie was bad. So the teacher sent her to the principles office. Instead of the principles office Sadie went home.

Ensa Dale — Barney Steele — 5 - 23

One day Barney was in the janitor's office and he was squirting soap all over. The janitor saw Barney come out of his office with soap on his shirt sleeve.

Joanny McMinn — The Spelling Test — 5 - 24

One day we were having a spelling test. Flossie saw Buzzby peeking at Hermans spelling Flossie told Tamy to tell the teacher.

Sweed Khan — Tubs, the stealer — 5 - 25

One time Bugs saw Tubs steal Slug's pencil and rubber. Right away Tubs saw Bugs the teacher's Mathematics answer book.

GRADE SIX

Paul Gummersall — The Slide — 6 - 1

At lunch when Al Peterson was on his way to school he stopped to slide on the slide. He did not notice the sign that said stay off. Jack Alson was standing on the slide. Al went down and knocked Jack down.

David Foster — The Lost Ball — 6 - 2

One day when Jim and Rob were playing four square the bell rang. Then somebody kicked the ball into the field. Jim told the others to get the ball but no one got it. When Jim came out for recess it wasn't there.

Pierre Charbonneau — The Fight — 6 - 3

One day a kid named Bobby Ditch and his friends were walking around. Bobby was hurt by someone. Lisa Johnson saw who did it.

Alan Zelcovitch — Should I or Shouldn't I — 6 -4

One day Rig Fase was going home to lunch. Just before he walked out the school door he saw Big Eggy. He quickly ran to another door where he saw Timinds. He said to himself, "how am I going to get out?" If I bash open the door with Timinds at it. I'll be in a fight. If I go through the door with Big Eggy by it. I'll have a broken back.

Billy Mitchell — The Promise — 6 - 5

A boy promised his teacher he would wash the rabbit cage and feed the rabbit. When the teacher went out the boy went out too. He got so involved he forgot what to do. The school door was locked.

Trish Neal — The Threat — 6 - 6

It was 3:30 and school was out. Cindy decided to go to the park. Becky was going to meet her there. Cindy was about 50 feet from the park when she thought she heard someone crying. "Oh No!" It's Big Joe and his gang. They are beating up Becky!

"Boy, now I'm in trouble, they've spotted me" Cindy said. Joe shouted "Hey kid, you snitch on us and we'll personally beat your brains out of your skull, OK?"

Kaye Danko — Broken Window — 6 - 7

Tammie's day started out all wrong so she decided she would just sit down at recess. She did but while recess was on she saw Frank throw a ball at one of the windows and the window broke. But worst of all Frank saw her.

Angie Veteree — Volleyball Game — 6 - 8

Sandy was the captain of the girls' volleyball game. Her best friend was Carolyn Lack. Sandy's and Carolyn's team always won against the other teams. There were rules for the game and if anyone ever broke the rules, they could not play again. Sandy's team was in the finals. They lost. Carolyn flew into a rage and broke one of the rules. It was up to Sandy to tell her she couldn't play anymore.

Julie Heinig — The Scribblers — 6 - 9

One day when Christopher walking into his class room to get his books after school, he saw three people which he knew. They were scribbling on the chalkboard.

Christina Dalli — A Girl in the Coatroom — 6 - 10

One day Liona saw a Marni in the coatroom looking in peoples' coats. Marni was Leona's beat girlfriend.

Karen Ratcliff — My Friend the Book Breaker — 6 - 11

One day Lahne had to stay after school to finish up a story. Lahne's best friend Marsha Moose was in too. When Lahne had finished the teacher had already left so Lehne went. Marsha was the only one left. Lahne had gotten half way home when she remembered her hat. I had left it in my desk. When Lehne got back to school she saw Marsha ripping up a new text book. Marsha had always been Lahne's friend.

Debbie Cadieux — Who Should get it? — 6 - 12

One day Sally got a doll from her friend Karen. Karen found the doll, but she still gave it to Sally. Sally loved the doll every much. The next day Karen came to school and said that the little girl who had lost the doll had wanted it back. But Sally said she had given the doll to her little sister for her birthday.

Vera Lo — The Teacher's Pet — 6 - 13

One day Harry, the dumbest boy in the class was copying Veronica's work. Poor Veronica thought of telling Miss Kinkletoe, her teacher, but Harry was the teacher's pet. Miss Kinkletoe would of course, make a dumb excuse and Harry wouldn't get in trouble; instead, Veronica would.

Anonymous — The Break In — 6 - 14

Schmo saw Irving and Moshe break into the school. They caused lots of damage. They didn't get caught.

John Pinkerton — The Ripped Book — 6 - 15

Tarzan saw Joe take a math book to the washroom. And rip some pages out of it. Tarzan was Joe's friend.

Kim Marshall — The Swing Mystery — 6 - 16

One day when Beaver was at the park, the group Beaver was in, which is only a gang Beaver hung around with, decided to take down one of the swings. Since Beaver hung around them, they wanted Beaver to help them. They were rough kids.

Donna Fetterly — The Sneak — 6 - 17

Well one day in school the class was having art and Mrs. Gay said that we could only take one piece of paper to do our art on. If anyone makes a mistake she wouldn't be allowed to take an other piece of paper. Well, Mousey saw Winkey take an other piece of paper.

Diane Porter — Bratty Bill — 6 - 18

One day Lisa and Susan were playing tag. Bratty Bill came and pushed Susan down and broke her glasses.

David Harrell — Hookey — 6 - 19

One day Harry, Joe and Will decided to play hookey, but all of a sudden Joe didn't want to. Then Harry and Will started calling him a sissy. Then Joe said "just for that I'm going to tell on you." And then Harry said "oh yeh if you do we're going to knock yah flat."

SECTION III

Role-Playing Project

ROLE-PLAYING PROJECT

Joseph Murphy
Co-Principal Investigator

July 1976

INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been an evolving consensus among educational policy makers that human values education has to be consciously and systematically pursued in the public system of education. This need was emphasized in the United States by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association (1951) and in Canada by the Committee on Religious Education in the Public Schools of Ontario (1969). There remains, however, much controversy over how to implement the teaching of values in a pluralistic society.

The foundations of good human relations are laid in the early school years. As the child moves from a predominantly egocentric position to a more sociocentric one, active involvement in the study of human relations will sensitize him to the needs of others (Fleres and Benmaman, 1974). If such involvement is not encouraged, then it becomes increasingly difficult to understand the relationship between the individual and society. For as the child begins to understand how his own feelings

shape his behaviour, he also comes to appreciate the relationships between and among the motives and actions of others.

Sociodrama, or role-playing, is a group problem-solving method that enables young people to explore, in spontaneous enactments followed by guided discussion, how they tend to solve interpersonal problems, what alternatives are available to them, and what the personal and social consequences are of the proposals they offer (Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967). The major purpose of the present study was to determine if, as a result of role-playing experiences, young people would increasingly move toward a more decentered position and mature in the development of their human values.

Background of the Study

The cognitive-developmental theory of moral reasoning developed by Lawrence Kohlberg and his associates is concerned with the structures of reasoning and judgment upon which one's beliefs are based and not so much with the content of what one believes about a moral issue (Kohlberg, 1963). This approach to the teaching of values is more likely to be accepted in our pluralistic society than approaches that centre on the transmission of specific value systems (Beck, 1972; Burnham, 1975; Kohlberg, 1973; Peterson, 1970; and Riles, 1975).

The work of Selman (1971) suggested that social perspective-taking develops according to systematic sequences of stages that parallel Kohlberg's

levels of moral reasoning. This social perspective-taking skill was seen as a necessary condition for the development of moral conceptions. A program that aims to stimulate and exercise the child's social perspective-taking ability across a range of social situations was considered to have the potential for assisting in the development of more mature moral judgments. This study proposed to respond to this possibility.

Rationale

If human values education is to be consciously and systematically pursued in the public school system, an approach that finds acceptance in our pluralistic society must be used. One approach that is nondoctrinal and is potentially acceptable to most people focuses on the development of moral reasoning.

A necessary condition for the stimulation of moral reasoning was seen to be social perspective-taking ability. However, it was argued that social perspective-taking is not a sufficient condition for growth toward more mature levels of moral reasoning (Selman, 1975).

Sociodrama, or role-playing has been presented as an effective technique for educating for individual integrity and group problem solving (Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967). However, it remained unclear whether sociodrama had any direct influence on levels of social perspective-taking and levels of moral reasoning. This study presumed to clarify the nature of these relationships.

Elementary school counselors have always been concerned, at least implicitly, with the overall personal development of children. More specifically, the role of the elementary school counselor has the potential for influencing the level of social and moral development of children (Graham, 1975; Mosher & Sullivan, 1974; and Wilson, 1971). Counselors are familiar with role-playing procedures and have the skills essential for effective interventions using this technique. The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which pupils' levels of social perspective-taking and levels of moral reasoning were influenced by guided role-playing experiences.

Statement of the Problem

What is the contribution of role-playing to the level of social perspective-taking and to the level of moral reasoning of elementary school pupils? In particular, does intervention by means of role-playing activities contribute to the development of elementary school pupils' levels of social perspective-taking and levels of moral reasoning? In addition, can role-playing contribute to an increase in the moral reasoning level of pupils in elementary school beyond the parallel sócial perspective-taking level?

Specifically, this study asked three questions: (a) How does role-playing contribute to the levels of moral reasoning of elementary school pupils? (b) How does role-playing contribute to the levels of social

perspective-taking of elementary school pupils? (c) Can role-playing increase the level of moral reasoning of elementary school pupils beyond the parallel level of social perspective-taking?

Definition of Terms

This study defined three terms as follows:

1. Role-playing. This referred to a group problem-solving method that enables young people to explore interpersonal problems in spontaneous enactments followed by guided discussion -- utilizing critical evaluation and full discussion in a supportive atmosphere -- of how they tend to solve such problems, of what alternatives are available to them, and of what the personal and social consequences are of the proposals they offer.

2. Level of moral reasoning. This represented a measure of a pupil's development of moral reasoning concerning positive justice issues as reflected in his score on Damon's scale (see Appendix A0.

3. Level of social perspective-taking. This indicated a pupil's development of interpersonal cognition as reflected in his score on Selman's scale (see Appendix B).

Limitations of the Study

This research had the following limitations: (a) The elementary school counselor who applied the intervention volunteered and was not selected at random. (b) Assignment of pupils to experimental conditions was not truly

random in that intact classes were involved. (c) The measures of social perspective-taking and moral reasoning were of unknown validity (Loevinger, 1974). (d) The findings cannot be generalized beyond the sample population.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Three areas of research literature are examined in relation to this study. The first area deals with research concerning moral development theory particularly the cognitive-developmental approach of Kohlberg and Damon. The second area of research is focused upon social perspective-taking ability as explained by Selman and his associates, and specific reference is made to the relation of this ability to moral reasoning. The third area of research pertains to role-playing as an instructional methodology for social skills development. The objective of this examination was to demonstrate the relationship of social perspective-taking to moral reasoning and to provide a methodology for influencing development in these two areas. Based upon these postulated relationships, an experimental program was devised and tested for support.

Moral Reasoning

Early approaches to moral development dealt with the problems of the origin of moral values as a cultural phenomenon. It was assumed that

morality was a system of rules and values defined by the culture and that the individual child acquired these rules and values by general cultural-transmission mechanisms such as social reinforcement and modelling. The Hartshorne and May (1928) study focused on a culturally defined value, "honesty," which was measured by a person's disposition to resist the temptation of breaking a rule under conditions of reduced likelihood of detection or punishment. One of the difficulties with the work of these researchers was their assumption that those issues which have moral significance for adults function in a similar way with young children.

Later approaches to the study of moral development were primarily concerned with the cognitive capacity to make judgments in terms of an internalized standard of morality and to justify holding the standard to oneself and others. The empirical investigations undertaken by Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1958) had their roots in the rational, volitional, tradition of Kantian philosophy, as it was expressed by developmental theorists such as James Baldwin (1906). Baldwin argued for two moralities arising sequentially in an individual's development. The first stage of moral development was seen to be moral judgment based upon respect for custom and authority; and the judgment of right and wrong in accordance with universal principles, justice, and social welfare consequences was seen as the second stage of moral development.

Piaget (1932) studied children's responses to moral dilemmas, and his findings confirmed Baldwin's theory of moral development as a two-step process beginning with respect for adult rules as sacred and invariant (heteronomy) and ending with an adherence to principles of equity (autonomy) that are widely shared by members of society.

In their work on cognition, Piaget and Inhelder (1968) further developed the idea of stage development. They suggest that some of the characteristics of stages are that they form an invariant sequence, each builds on the previous stage and prepares for the next, and there is an inner logic which provides coherence, unity, and stability.

Kohlberg's Theory

Kohlberg (1958, 1963, 1969, 1973) used elements of Piaget's methods and reasoning to derive his cognitive-developmental approach to moral development. It has been largely this research of Kohlberg that has created considerable doubt concerning the two-step system of moral development theorized by Piaget. Kohlberg's approach, like Piaget's, is concerned not so much with the content of what one believes about a moral issue as with the structure of reasoning and judgment upon which one's beliefs are based.

Kohlberg's theory suggests that people develop in their moral reasoning by progressing through a series of stages in which each successive one is characterized by a more decentered perspective than the previous. Rate

of progress through this invariant sequence of stages varies from individual to individual, and a person may terminate development at any stage. Movement to the next higher stage is seen as a response to a state of cognitive disequilibrium caused by the exposure to reasoning one level above one's present level (Kohlberg, 1973). On the basis of responses to dilemma situations, Kohlberg advanced the position that moral development falls into three moral levels, each of which subsumes two stages as follows.

Level 0--premoral period. The child makes judgments of good on the basis of what he likes and wants or what helps him, and bad on the basis of what he does not like or what hurts him. He has no concept of rules or of obligations to obey independent of his wishes.

Level 1--preconventional morality. At this level, the child is responsive to cultural rules and labels of good and bad, right or wrong, but he interprets the labels in terms of either the physical consequences of action (punishment, reward, exchange of favors) or the physical power of those who enunciate the rules or labels. Moral values are perceived to exist outside the individual rather than in internalized standards.

Stage 1 responses are based upon a punishment and obedience orientation. The physical consequences of an act determine its goodness or badness regardless of the human meaning or value of these consequences. Avoidance of punishment and deference to power are valued in their own

right, not in terms of respect for an underlying moral order.

Stage 2 responses are characterized by definitions of responsibility in terms of instrumental relativism. Right action consists of that which instrumentally satisfies one's own needs and occasionally the needs of others. The total deference to authority has been surpassed, and one is better able to evaluate the consequences of action.

Level 2--conventional morality. The person at this level has internalized rules that base moral decisions upon performing good or correct rules, or in maintaining the conventional order and expectations of others. Maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, group, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right, regardless of immediate and obvious consequences.

Stage 3 responses are primarily based upon directing one's behavior toward pleasing and helping others. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or "natural" behavior. One earns approval by being a "good boy" or a "nice girl."

Stage 4 responses are governed by an internalized sense of respect for law and order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, and maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

Level 3--postconventional morality. At this level there is a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and

application apart from the authority of the group or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups. Persons at this level understand the premises underlying previous levels of morality and can examine the arbitrary nature of conventions and laws.

Stage 5 responses define duty in contractual terms. An action should be taken because free humans have agreed to it. Breaking such an agreement is possible if the decision to do so is compatible with the individual respondent's welfare and the welfare of others. There is a clear awareness of the relativism of personal values and opinions and a corresponding emphasis upon procedural rules for reaching consensus. Aside from what is constitutionally and democratically agreed upon, the right is a matter of personal "values" and "opinions." The result is an emphasis on a legal perspective, but with an emphasis upon the possibility of changing the law in terms of rational considerations of social utility. Outside the legal realm, free agreement and contract is the binding element of obligation.

Stage 6 responses are in terms of internalized universal principles. Social roles can be justified if they are compatible with moral principles. Right is defined by the decision of conscience in accord with self-chosen ethical principles that are logically comprehensive, universal, and consistent.

Damon's Theory

However, Kohlberg's research has concentrated primarily on late childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. The validity of Kohlbergian theory for children younger than ten years of age was questioned by Damon who redefined Kohlberg's premoral and preconventional levels of moral reasoning. Damon (1971) considered positive justice -- specifically, the justice of distribution, determining who in society should get what share of the available resources -- to be the core structure of moral cognition in young children. Damon used this concept to provide a more detailed structural analysis of the young child's moral reasoning than did earlier versions posited by Kohlberg. Damon (1973) argued that moral reasoning for children between the ages of four and ten may be categorized into three major stages: 0, 1, and 2 -- each of which may be divided into two substages "A" and "B." Each of Damon's major stages roughly parallels Kohlberg's substages having the same numerical designation.

The developmental progression described by Damon's (1974) series of substages revolves around four related aspects of the child's reasoning in the area of positive justice. These aspects are: (a) the types of justice conflict recognized by the child, (b) the means that the child constructs to resolve these conflicts, (c) the persons considered to be significant in determining a "fair" resolution to the conflict, and (d) the nature of the justification that the child uses to support his position.

The six substages of moral reasoning for children between the ages of four and ten presented by Damon are summarized as follows.

Substage 0--A. At this earliest level moral choices simply derive from a child's wish for an act to occur. The choice and the reason for the choice are undifferentiated. The child recognizes only those conflicts involving his desires and obstacles to their fulfilment. These conflicts are resolved by assuring pleasant consequences to himself or others with whom he associates or "likes." This justification is egocentric and subjective with no awareness of a need to support his choice with external, objective reasons.

Substage 0--B. Moral choices at this level are ostensibly justified on the basis of physical or social realities. However, these justifications still reflect the egocentric values of what the child wants to happen. He now recognizes that others have desires as well as himself; and, therefore, he realizes that there is a need to justify his decisions on grounds more universally accepted than a reference to his own wishes. The child at 0--B, as at 0--A, resolves his conflicts by awarding preferential treatment to himself or to those closely associated to himself.

Substage 1--A. At this point the child recognizes that two or more persons may be in conflict, and each one is now considered as a distinct, objective being. However, each person in the conflict is seen as having his own self-interest as his primary goal. The 1--A child treats all persons

equally, allowing for no mitigating circumstances or reasons. This child prescribes on the basis of what he observes as the social realities of the world. An act is wrong because it is punished and right because it is rewarded. Equal treatment is applied to all, and this principle is supported with reference to the self-interest of each.

Substage 1--B. The child at this level recognizes conflicts between persons with "deserving" claims that go beyond their simple desires. In resolving them he treats people differentially according to their possession of some merit criteria. All those who have made a contribution are considered significant in direct proportion to the degree of that contribution. In justifying his position, the 1--B child attempts to incorporate notions of reciprocal obligation; but, since the valuing of reciprocity is unilateral, reasoning remains absolute and inflexible. This child decides on the basis of his view of another's intentions and a primitive notion of reciprocity -- that everyone should be paid back in kind for doing good or bad things.

Substage 2--A. A plurality of disparate claims to justice are recognized by the child at this level. Consequently a moral relativity develops out of his understanding that different persons can have different justifications for similar acts. The 2--A child attempts to resolve these conflicts through mechanisms of compromise which are often quantitative -- awarding the most to the person with the best claim. These justifications show respect for all persons equally, and there is frequently the assertion that each is right "in a way."

Substage 2--B. This sixth level of reasoning, as in 2--A, is also characterized by the recognition of a variety of competing justice claims. However, resolution is accomplished by systematically excluding all but the "best claim." Efforts to coordinate the various claims to justice, including those of equality and reciprocity, are evident at this level.

Although 2--B reasoning is significantly advanced over earlier levels, it leaves many problems to be worked out -- the confusion of means with ends and just solutions with utilitarian ones, the limitation of considering as significant only those concretely present, and the situation-oriented code of fairness. But these concerns do not bother most children before the age of 10 (Damon, 1974).

Social Perspective-Taking

The writings of Baldwin (1906) and Mead (1934) support the position that the unique aspect of social cognition and judgment that differentiates human from subhuman functioning is role-taking -- the ability to understand oneself and others as subjects, to react to others as like oneself, and to react to one's own behavior from the other's point of view. The concept of role-taking also has roots in the theory of cognitive development of Piaget (1968). Two of his concepts that relate directly to role-taking are: (a) egocentrism, the inability to escape from one's own view of the world; and (b) decentration, the ability to consider multiple perspectives.

Feffer (1959) equated social perspective-taking with the Piagetian concept of decentration, and he has developed a projective technique for assessing age-related levels of a child's ability to decenter in the social realm. He has described three levels of this ability: (a) simple refocusing, in which there is no coordination between perspectives; (b) consistent elaboration, defined as a sequential coordination between perspectives; and (c) change of perspective, characterized by the simultaneous coordination of perspectives.

The empirical research of Flavell (1968) represents another attempt to clarify the concept of social perspective-taking. In his study of the development of children's ability to make inferences about another's point of view, Flavell isolated three crucial steps in the sequence: (a) one's realization that others can have cognitions about oneself as well as about other external objects, (b) one's recogniton that other's not only view him as an object but also as a subject, and (c) the realization that both oneself and another can go on considering each other's view of the other ad infinitum.

Selman and associates (Selman, 1971; Selman, Damon & Gordon, 1973; Selman & Byrne, 1974; Selman, 1975) have focused their research on the young child's ability to take another's perspective and the relation of this ability to the development of more advanced moral reasoning. Piaget (1932) had argued that prior to the acquisition of decentering

ability -- incorporating the points of view of others -- heteronomous (advanced) morality was not possible. Likewise, Kohlberg (1971) has held that all morally relevant rules and institutions are interpreted through role-taking processes directed by a concern for both welfare and justice.

On the basis of the analyses of role-taking done by Feffer (1959) and Flavell (1968) as well as the developmental principles of differentiation (distinguishing perspectives) and integration (relating perspectives), Selman and Byrne (1974) derived a sequence of developmental, age-related, and logically related structures that a child displays in his understanding of another's point of view. These structures constitute a series of role-taking levels as follows.

Level 0--egocentric perspective-taking. Although the child at this level can differentiate himself from others at entities, he can neither differentiate nor relate their points of view. He does not realize that another may see a social situation differently from the way he does.

Level 1--subjective perspective-taking. The child begins to understand that other people may feel differently or think differently because they are in a different situation or have different information. He is not able, however, to keep his own perspective and simultaneously put himself in the place of others in attempting to judge their actions. Nor can the child at this level judge his own actions from another's point of view.

He understands the subjectivity of persons but does not understand that persons may consider each other as subjects rather than only as social objects.

Level 2--self-reflective perspective-taking. The young child is now aware that people think and feel differently because each has his own uniquely ordered set of values or purposes. He recognizes that his own behavior, thoughts, feelings, and intentions may be under scrutiny by another and can anticipate another's perspective of himself. At this level the child can see himself from another's point of view, and he also recognizes that another person can take his point of view. But these reflections do not occur simultaneously or mutually. They only occur sequentially.

Level 3--mutual perspective-taking. The child can now distinguish between his own perspective and the generalized or average point of view. He is able to maintain a disinterested or spectator position in viewing social interactions. He is aware that both he and another can consider each other's perspective simultaneously and mutually. In addition, each can consider a situation from a third party perspective in which each individual's point of view is considered.

Level 4--qualitative-system perspective-taking. The adolescent can understand that the subjective perspectives of persons toward one another exist not only on the level of mutual expectations but also at deeper levels.

He sees that perspectives between persons form a network or system. Multiple levels of perspective-taking and multiple systems of perspectives are conceptualized at this level.

Level 5--symbolic interaction perspective-taking. Perspective-taking is seen as a method for the analysis of interpersonal and social relations. Due to the nature of human subjectivity itself, the level 5 person does not necessarily "know" the other's perspective as content. Mutual understanding is seen to occur through the use of similar processes of social reasoning.

Selman and Byrne (1974) have shown that progress to Kohlberg's level of conventional morality is dependent upon mutual perspective-taking ability. One of the major conclusions of the study by Selman, Damon and Gordon (1973) was that each social perspective-taking level is a necessary condition (but not a sufficient one) for development to the parallel level of moral reasoning. Specifically, subjective perspective-taking (Level 1) is a necessary condition for moral reasoning Substage 1--B; and self-reflective perspective-taking ability (Level 2) is a necessary prerequisite for moral reasoning Substage 2--B. Cognitive development as another necessary condition for moral judgment has been studied recently by Tomlinson-Keasy and Keasy (1974) and Damon (1975). However, it would appear that no definitive relationship has yet been established.

The relationship between social perspective-taking and moral reasoning has been demonstrated by Selman, Damon and their associates (Selman, Damon, Gordon & Lieberman, 1973; and Selman, Gordon & Damon, 1973). It remained to be determined if, as Moir (1974) has asked, training in role-taking is possible. This study attempted to respond to this question by exploring the influence of role-playing exercises on levels of social perspective-taking and moral reasoning.

Role-Playing

Value education programs based on Kohlberg's theory of moral development tend to have their general aim stated in terms of movement toward more advanced levels of moral reasoning. The most common format of these programs involves the discussion of moral dilemmas by a teacher and the class. This approach has been attempted at the elementary school (Beck, 1971), secondary school (Blatt, 1969; Blatt and Kohlberg, 1974) and college level (Boyd, 1973). Hickey (1974) has also used this method with prison inmates. In addition, a variant of this approach has been incorporated into the Deliberate Psychological Education program of Mosher and Sprinthall (1970). The effectiveness of these programs has yet to be conclusively demonstrated. It would appear that other approaches might have greater success.

In this study of the relationship between egocentrism and the emergence of conventional morality, Moir (1974) asked whether training in role-taking

is possible. One method of teaching that might influence social perspective-taking and moral reasoning is role-playing. Considerable research has been done to demonstrate the use of role-playing as an instructional medium in a variety of settings. Rosen (1974) and Smilansky (1968) reported on pre-school programs involving role-playing. Dinkmeyer's kit for Developing Understanding in Self and Others (DUSO) includes role-playing activities for use in elementary school guidance programs. Chesler & Fox (1966) and Lippitt, Fox & Schaible (1969) described the use of role-playing in social studies programs at both the elementary and secondary school level. Schmuck (1968) discussed its use in training teachers to better understand group processes. Chesler and Lohman (1971) reported on the use of role-playing in organization development projects concerned with conflict resolution.

Much of the current literature on role-playing may be traced to the writings of Jacob Moreno (1946) Sherif (1947) and Shaftel (1948). Shaftel and Shaftel (1967) present a theory and methodology of role-playing that has potential application for human values education. In its simplest sense, role-playing may be viewed as the spontaneous practice of roles -- assuming them in order to practice the behavior required in a variety of situations. Role-playing is not aimed at achieving therapy, but it is a set of procedures that employs all the techniques of critical evaluation implied in the terms "listening," "discussion" and "problem-solving." It

uses a verbal, symbolic model and proceeds through problem-definition, delineation of alternatives and decision-making. The process of role-playing outlined by Shaftel and Shaftel (1967) consists of a specific sequence of steps:

1. "Warming up" the group
2. Selecting the participants
3. Setting the stage
4. Preparing the audience
5. Role-playing
6. Discussion and evaluation
7. Re-enactment
8. Further discussion
9. Sharing experience and generalization

In "warming up" the group, the leader acquaints the participants with the problem situation to arouse their awareness of the need to learn ways of dealing with the problem. This also helps them to identify with the individuals in the problem.

Participants are usually selected by the teacher from those pupils who have identified with the roles and who can feel the parts. While volunteers may be called for, the teacher usually avoids assigning roles to children who have been volunteered for those roles by others. This may be a form of punishment or a particular child may not identify with a role thrust on him.

The role-players set the stage by briefly planning what they are going to do. No dialogue is prepared but they simply decide in a general way on a line of action. Since role-playing is considered to have maximum

benefit when completely spontaneous, there are no set speeches and no detailed plotting.

The teacher prepares the audience to be participating observers by assigning the group to various observer tasks. This is intended to help them to become good listeners to other's feelings and ideas so that they might learn from the other person's perceptions.

In the enactment of the problem situation the role-players assume the roles and live the situation, responding to one another's words and actions as they feel the people in those roles would behave. Since there is no set plot, each participant reacts spontaneously to the developing situation.

During the discussion and evaluation period both the participants and observers learn, with the support and often with the opposition of the peers, to consider alternatives, consequences, and different points of view.

If decided, the situation may be re-enacted by new participants who may assume the roles to demonstrate their interpretation of the situation. Or the original participants may wish to play their role over again, changing their interpretations in the light of the suggestions they receive in the discussion. Role-reversals may be useful in developing an appreciation for the other's point of view. This re-enactment is followed by further discussion in which the participating observers and the role-players have an opportunity to discuss new alternatives, consequences, and solutions.

The process concludes with a period of general discussion and sharing of experiences. This is intended to allow the pupils to examine what has happened and consider the possible application that it might have for situations in which they find themselves.

This role-playing process has been suggested as a useful methodology in helping children to see causal relationships, improve self-concept, explore various roles, and develop sensitivity to the feelings of others (Shaftel & Shaftel, 1967). Price (1964) has suggested that a sensitivity to the feelings of others is the basis for the eventual development of concern for others and for responsible personal and group behavior. This study attempted to determine whether role-playing can influence social perspective-taking and moral reasoning.

SUMMARY

An effort was made to influence the moral reasoning and social perspective-taking levels of elementary school pupils by participation in guided role-playing activities. Eighty-four students (28 second-graders and 56 fourth-graders) of an elementary public school in a predominantly white, middle-class, urban neighborhood in southern Ontario (Canada) were the subjects. Pupils were assigned to one of four experimental groups of a modified Solomon 4-way design. The Experimental Group was pretested, received the intervention, and was posttested. Control Group 1 was pretested and posttested. Control Group 2 received the intervention, and was posttested. Control Group 3 was posttested. All testing consisted of a semi-structured interview from which levels of moral reasoning and social perspective-taking were derived. Intervention consisted of a series of 15 guided role-playing exercises directed by the guidance counselor. A 2 x 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance and a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of covariance were used to test the hypotheses. In general, support was not found for the thesis that moral reasoning levels and social perspective-taking levels are influenced by role-playing. However, evidence in support of the age-related nature of these constructs as well as their parallel development pattern was found. It is suggested that further research efforts in moral education might benefit from the development of instruments of known validity. Further, increased precision in assigning social perspective-taking levels and moral reasoning levels to students might be of assistance to the counselor prior to the

intervention. This knowledge would further guide the counselor in directing the role-playing exercises. Although Shaftel's methodology is potentially useful, in this context of moral development it might have been augmented by a knowledge of moral reasoning levels and social perspective-taking levels prior to intervention by the counselor.

REFERENCES

References

Beck, C. Ethics. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972.

Burnham, B. Human values education: the new dynamic in program development. Education Canada, 1975, 1, 4-10.

Campbell, D. Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings. Psychological Bulletin, 1957, 54, 297-312.

Chesler, M., & Fox, R. Role-playing methods in the classroom. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1966.

Committee on Religious Education in the Public Schools of Ontario. Religious information and moral development. Toronto, Ontario: Government of Ontario, 1969.

Damon, W. The child's conception of justice. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of California, 1971.

Damon, W. The development of the child's conception of justice. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Philadelphia, March 1973.

Damon, W. Studying early moral development: some techniques for interviewing young children and for analyzing the results. Unpublished manuscript, Clark University, 1974.

Educational Policies Commission. Moral and spiritual values in the public schools. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1951.

Feffer, M. Cognitive aspects of role-taking in children. Journal of Personality, 1960, 28, 383-396.

Flavell, J. The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Fleres, C., & Benmamon, V. Designing a human relations curriculum. Educational Leadership, 1974, 32(1), 31-34.

Graham, R. Moral education: a child's right to a just community. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1975, 8, 299-308.

Hartshorne, H., & May, M. Studies in character. New York: MacMillan, 1928.

Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Kohlberg, L. The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. Vita Humana, 1963, 6, 11-33.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: the cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. New York: Rand McNally, 1969.

Kohlberg, L. The child as a moral philosopher. In S. B. Simon & H. Kirschenbaum (Eds.), Readings in values clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

Lippitt, R., Fox, R., & Schaible, L. The teacher's role in social science investigation. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1969.

Loevinger, J. Issues in the measurement of moral development. Proceedings of the 35th Educational Testing Service Invitational Conference, 1974, 1, 57-68.

Moir, D. J. Egocentrism and the emergence of conventional morality in pre-adolescent girls. Child Development, 1974, 45, 299-304.

Mosher, R. L., & Sullivan, P. Moral education: a new initiative for guidance. Focus on Guidance, 1974, 6(5), 1-12.

Murphy, H.J. The contribution of role-playing to the social perspective-taking levels and moral reasoning levels of elementary school pupils. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1976.

Peterson, J. Counseling and values. Scranton, Penn.: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. Glencoe, Ill,.: Free Press, 1932.

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. The psychology of the child. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Price, R. Needed research in the teaching of the social studies. National Council for the Social Studies, Research Bulletin No. 1, National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1964.

Riles, W. The role of the school in moral development. Proceedings of the 35th Educational Testing Service Invitational Conference, 1974, 1, 69-79.

Rosen, C. The effects of sociodramatic play on problem-solving behavior among culturally disadvantaged preschool children. Child Development, 1974, 45, 920-927.

Selman, R. The relation of role-taking to the development of moral judgment in children. Child Development, 1971, 42, 79-92.

Selman, R. A developmental approach to interpersonal and moral awareness in young children: some theoretical and educational implications of levels of social perspective-taking. Paper presented at the Canadian National Conference on Values Education, Toronto, February 1975.

Selman, R., & Byrne, D. A structural-developmental analysis of levels of role-taking in middle childhood. Child Development, 1974, 45, 803-806.

Selman, R., Damon, W., Gordon, A., & Lieberman, M. Progress report and position paper: social-cognitive development in children ages four to ten. (Moral Education and Research Foundation Report No. RS 2) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1973.

Selman, R., Gordon, A., & Damon, W. The relation between stages of social role-taking and stages of justice conception in children ages four to ten. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., May 1973.

Shaftel, F. R., & Shaftel, G. Role-playing for social values: decision-making in the social studies. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Smilansky, S. The effects of sociodramatic play on disadvantaged pre-school children. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

Solomon, R. An extension of control group design. Psychological Bulletin, 1949, 46, 137-150.

Tomlinson-Keasy, C., & Keasy, C. The mediating role of cognitive development in moral judgment. Child Development, 1974, 45, 291-298.

West, H. Early peer-group interaction and role-taking skills: an investigation of Israeli children. Child Development, 1974, 45, 1118-1121.

Wilson, J. H. The new social studies and elementary school guidance. In G. D. Mills (Ed.), Elementary school guidance and counseling. New York: Random House, 1971.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Moral Reasoning Score (MRS) Transformations of Corresponding Qualitative Scores (Damon, 1973)

Qualitative Score		MRS
Substage	0A	000
	0A (0B)	025
	0B	050
	0B (1A)	075
	1A	100
	1A (1B)	125
	1B	150
	1B (2A)	175
	2A	200
	2A (2B)	225
	2B	250

Appendix B

Social Perspective-taking Score (SP-TS) Transformations of Corresponding Qualitative Scores (Selman, 1971)

Qualitative Score	SP-TS
Level 0 -- egocentric perspective-taking	0
Level 1 -- subjective perspective-taking	1
Level 2 -- self-reflective perspective-taking	2
Level 3 -- mutual perspective-taking	3